

spirits for beverage purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 436. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to make investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 437. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4244; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 438. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3565; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 439. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4243; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 440. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3748; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 441. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3016; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 442. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1335; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 443. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4309; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 444. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4212; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5056. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5057. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Walter Wetteschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5059. A bill to authorize Martin Travieso, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, to accept a decoration from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of John S. Steber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of James B. DeHart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1170. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Robert C. Reigert and 214 other veterans, students at the University of Cincinnati, in support of an increase in subsistence rates under Public Laws 346 and 16; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1171. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 75 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. Also, petition of 16 residents of New Castle, Pa., in favor of S. 265, a bill to abolish liquor advertisements in magazines, radio programs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1173. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 36 residents of Somerton, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1174. Also, petition of 225 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by the American Legion Auxiliary of Argonne Post, No. 33, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1175. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 54 residents of Snow Hill, Md., and 2 residents of Pocomoke City, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1176. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Crisfield, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1177. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1178. Also, petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1179. Also, petition of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1180. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Roy C. Morgan, commander, New Milford Post, No. 217, American Legion, and 80 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. Also, petition of F. C. Hazard, adjutant, Teaneck Post, No. 128, American Legion, Teaneck, N. J., and 61 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary Strobel and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to lower foreign postage rate; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1183. Also, petition of Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2848; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord most high and very near, to whose mind the past and the future meet in this very day, hear us as we pray.

The great questions that stand unanswered before us defy our best wisdom.

Though our ignorance is great, at least we know we do not know.

When we do not know what to say, keep us quiet.

When we do not know what to do, let us ask of Thee, that we may find out.

We dare to ask for light upon only one step at a time.

We would rather walk with Thee than jump by ourselves.

We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ, who promised to send us a guide into all truth. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 19, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;  
 S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;  
 S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;  
 S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;  
 S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;  
 S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;  
 S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;  
 S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;  
 S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and  
 S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564); and  
 S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. CRAVENS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goltia;  
 H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;  
 H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;  
 H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;  
 H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;  
 H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;  
 H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;  
 H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;  
 H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;  
 H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);  
 H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu;  
 H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;  
 H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reves;  
 H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);  
 H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer;  
 H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;  
 H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;  
 H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;  
 H. R. 1809. An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerd Huizenga;  
 H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;  
 H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;  
 H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;  
 H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;  
 H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;  
 H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;  
 H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsuo M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;  
 H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuero;  
 H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;  
 H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;  
 H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon;  
 H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Vidulich;  
 H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;  
 H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Flein;  
 H. R. 3061. An act for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski);  
 H. R. 3067. An act for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell;  
 H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mae H. Fitzgerald;  
 H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;  
 H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;  
 H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;  
 H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;  
 H. R. 3538. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage;  
 H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy;  
 H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;  
 H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25);  
 H. R. 3814. An act to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro

veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.;

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3930. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4141. An act to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Valda, Elena Valda, and Stefano Valda; and  
 H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 3342. An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### FURNISHING OF SERVICES AND DETAIL OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of services and the temporary detail of United States employees to public international organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### CONSOLIDATION AND REVISION OF LAW RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO TRANSMISSION AND SALE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Bonneville Administrator covering the transmission and sale of electric energy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANT, MUSCATINE, IOWA

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation



to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENTS OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, reporting pursuant to law, the average number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay during the period April 1 to October 1, 1947, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-first annual report of that Commission for the period November 1, 1946, to October 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the period ended November 1, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1947, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### OPINIONS AND DECISIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting volume 5 of its reports, pertaining to the opinions and decisions of that Commission for the calendar year 1946 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending an amendment to the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of

the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A letter from Representative RICHARD B. VAIL transmitting a letter from Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., relating to certain changes in a petition heretofore presented to the Senate by him (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Vergil D. McMillan, of Washington, D. C., praying for an investigation of the administration of the National Capital Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### AMENDMENT OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO CERTAIN WIDOWS OF VETERANS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Doucette-Lingard Post, No. 1624, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Gloucester, Mass., requesting Congress to amend all present laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of the veterans of any wars to authorize these widows and other dependents existing pensions without regard to any other income which they may be receiving from other sources. This resolution further requests that all income received by any widow or other surviving dependent be made free from Federal taxation.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has charge of this matter.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it resolved in regular meeting assembled of the Doucette-Lingard Post, No. 1624, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gloucester, Mass., That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend all existing laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of veterans of any wars participated in by the armed forces of the United States to allow (authorize) the previously mentioned widows and other dependents to draw the existing pensions regardless of any other income which they may be receiving from any source whatsoever; also be it*

*Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make all income received by any widow or other dependent of any veterans exempt from all taxation by Federal Government.*

Unanimously passed, December 10, 1947.

DOUCETTE-LINGARD POST,  
No. 1624, VFW.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE GRANGE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from Joab K. Mahood, secretary of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Harrisburg, Pa., setting forth the stand taken by his group in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I do not agree with the stand taken in this matter by this group, but send

their resolution to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the recurrent floods which sweep down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries have for many years taken a heavy toll of life and property; and

Whereas the floods along these rivers during the present year were among the worst on record, destroying crops, inundating millions of acres of farm lands, washing away the fertile topsoil, and inflicting heavy damages on other forms of property; and

Whereas Congress has approved a comprehensive plan for harnessing these rivers and putting an end to this wanton waste of our natural resources, which is sapping the life of the Nation and endangering the food supply of this and succeeding generations of Americans: Therefore be it

*Resolved, That the Pennsylvania State Grange urge the appropriation of adequate Federal funds to translate the plan in this connection into reality as speedily as the work can properly be done; and be it further*

*Resolved, That we believe it would be in accord with sound public policy to hold in abeyance an international project like the development of the St. Lawrence seaway while we devote our money, materials, and energies to the completion of this urgently needed and vitally important domestic undertaking.*

Adopted by the Pennsylvania State Grange at New Castle, Pa., October 30, 1947.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made by me as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee in connection with the appointment of Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, MEMBER OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The significance of the unusual legislation requested by the President with respect to the appointment of Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, a general officer of the Army of the United States, to membership on the Civil Aeronautics Board is emphasized by the invitation of the President to the membership of the Armed Services Committee to discuss this matter with him.

I think it is important that the real issue should be clearly defined, and I want my own position known.

The President requested Chairman GURNEY, of the Armed Services Committee, to introduce a special bill which would allow General Kuter to be appointed as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board (a civilian agency) and retain military emoluments of his active status as a major general in the Army, including pay, retirement, etc. These financial emoluments are: Base pay, \$8,800; flight pay, \$4,400; rental and subsistence allowance, \$1,944; making a total of \$15,144, while the civilian members of the Board would receive only \$10,000.

I am informed that by informal agreement with the Air Corps, General Kuter could continue to draw flight pay without military flying. This would be a special exception, which I especially disapprove. General Kuter would receive his pay from the Army and, in turn, the Army would be reimbursed

from the appropriation made for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I fully concur in what has been said as to the ability of General Kuter, but I think it is a most unwise procedure to transfer officers from active service in the military branches of the Government, where they owe primary allegiance to civilian duties, and then pay them, as in this case, \$5,000 annually more than is received by those appointed from civilian life.

Not only is the principle of unequal compensation involved, but, likewise, if such appointments are continued, they would develop a dangerous dominance by military services over civilian departments. The Armed Services Committee unanimously disapproved the bill when it was first proposed.

With regret, therefore, I am unable to agree to the President's additional request today that I withdraw my opposition to this special legislation for General Kuter.

We must be careful not to militarize the civilian functions and agencies of the Government.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1545. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; with amendments (Rept. No. 827); and

S. 1611. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 828).

#### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present an additional report of the Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel during November 1947. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with a statement by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report, together with the statement by Mr. BYRD, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH OCTOBER 1947

(The following report is compiled from signed, official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives, by agency, the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for November decreased 14,145 from the October total of 2,014,008 to the November total of 1,999,853. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was a decrease of 3,929 from the October total of 1,172,705 to the November total of 1,168,776.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed a decrease of 10,216 from the October total of 841,303 to the total of 831,087 in November.

The Department of the Army reported a net decrease of 10,222 from its October total of 390,406 to the November total of 380,184. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 2,264, while outside the United States the decrease amounted to 12,486. The bulk of the overseas decrease was reported by the Mediterranean theater, which is now in the process of closing down operations.

The Navy Department decreased its total employment 940 from the October figure of 340,159 to the November figure of 339,219.

The Air Forces increased employment 924 from the October figure of 110,305 to the November figure of 111,229. These figures do not include Air Force personnel overseas who are reported by the Department of the Army.

#### INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 1,054 from the October total of 1,778,972 to the November total of 1,777,918. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside the United States decreased 3,878 from the October figure of 1,119,278 to the November figure of 1,115,400.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment is 662,518 for November, an increase of 2,824 over the October figure of 659,694.

Department of the Army personnel within the United States increased 2,264 from the October figure of 252,878 to the November figure of 255,142.

Navy Department personnel within the United States decreased 386 from the October figure of 296,078 to the November figure of 295,692.

The Air Force Department increased 924 from the October total of 110,305 to the November total of 111,229.

#### OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 13,091 from the October total of 235,036 to the November total of 221,945. (See table III.)

A reduction of 51 was reported in overseas personnel by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment.

Total overseas employment for the National Military Establishment is 168,569, a decrease of 13,040 from the October figure of 181,609.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 12,486 from the October total of 137,528 to the November total of 125,042, most of which occurred in the Mediterranean theater.

The Department of the Navy reported a reduction of 554 overseas employees.

#### INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of November decreased 11,942 from the October total of 561,871 to the November total of 549,929. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, decreased 524.

The National Military Establishment increased a net amount of 11,418 from its October total of 540,129 to the November figure of 528,711.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment a total of 10,635. Inside United States there was an increase in industrial employment of 2,008. Outside United States industrial employment decreased 12,643.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 783.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as

airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Agriculture.....	73,144	70,683	-2,461
Commerce.....	34,150	34,125	-25
Interior.....	42,298	42,390	+92
Justice.....	24,087	24,844	+757
Labor.....	4,404	4,409	+5
Post Office.....	460,422	462,042	+1,620
State.....	7,181	7,256	+75
Treasury.....	85,537	84,706	-831
<b>EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of Defense Transportation.....	40	41	+1
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	58	48	-10
Office of Selective Service Records.....	641	640	-1
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Council of Economic Advisers.....	59	59	-----
National Security Council.....	-----	4	+4
National Security Resources Board.....	44	51	+7
Office of Government Reports.....	10	19	+9
Office of Housing Expedite.....	5,319	4,774	-545
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	2	3	+1
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.....	4,375	4,660	+285
War Assets Administration.....	33,213	31,947	-1,266
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	3	3	-----
Bureau of the Budget.....	606	599	-7
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	556	558	+2
Civil Service Commission.....	3,608	3,663	+55
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	111	114	+3
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,265	1,267	+2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,161	1,170	+9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	360	360	-----
Federal Power Commission.....	774	780	+6
Federal Security Agency.....	31,067	31,055	-12
Federal Trade Commission.....	558	559	+1
Federal Works Agency.....	22,806	22,743	-63
General Accounting Office.....	9,969	9,520	-449
Government Printing Office.....	7,539	7,578	+39
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	12,471	12,294	-177
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,264	2,265	+1
Maritime Commission.....	6,690	6,767	+77
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	6,023	6,048	+25
National Archives.....	328	326	-2
National Capital Housing Authority.....	278	287	+9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	19	21	+2
National Gallery of Art.....	317	318	+1
National Labor Relations Board.....	847	786	-61
National Mediation Board.....	103	102	-1
Panama Canal.....	646	549	-97
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,841	2,811	-30
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	6,707	6,520	-187
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,179	1,180	+1
Smithsonian Institution.....	516	516	-----
Tariff Commission.....	225	224	-1
Tax Court of the United States.....	125	124	-1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,649	14,514	-135

Footnotes at end of table.



TABLE I.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued</b>			
Veterans' Administration	207,073	207,078	+5
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,119,278	1,115,400	+2,485
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			-6,363
			-3,878
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Office of Secretary of Defense	433	455	+22
Department of the Army	252,878	255,142	+2,264
Department of the Navy	296,078	295,692	-386
Department of the Air Forces	110,305	111,229	+924
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,778,972	1,777,918	+5,695
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			-6,749
			-1,054

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted from the previously reported figure of 22,205.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Agriculture	1,741	1,816	+75
Commerce	2,649	2,649	—
Interior	4,863	4,800	-63
Justice	407	406	-1
Labor	77	78	+1
Post Office	1,537	1,540	+3
State	13,584	13,511	-73
Treasury	589	594	+5
<b>EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of Selective Service Records	20	19	-1
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of the Housing Expediter	28	28	—
Philippine Alien Property Administration	162	167	+5
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	—
War Assets Administration	516	509	-7
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission	96	96	—
Civil Aeronautics Board	14	15	+1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	—
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	—
Federal Communications Commission	36	36	—
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	—
Federal Security Agency	1,301	1,336	+35
Federal Works Agency	312	300	-12
Housing and Home Finance Agency	43	42	-1
Maritime Commission	148	146	-2
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	—
Panama Canal	23,606	23,577	-29
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	113	99	-14
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	—

TABLE II.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued</b>			
Veterans' Administration	1,574	1,591	+17
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	53,427	53,376	-193
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			+142
			-51
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Department of the Army	137,528	125,042	-12,486
Department of the Navy	44,081	43,527	-554
Total, including National Military Establishment	235,036	221,945	-13,233
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			+142
			-13,091

TABLE III.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Agriculture	74,885	72,499	-2,386
Commerce	36,799	36,774	-25
Interior	47,151	47,190	+39
Justice	25,094	25,250	+156
Labor	4,481	4,487	+6
Post Office	461,959	463,582	+1,623
State	20,765	20,767	+2
Treasury	86,126	85,300	-826
<b>EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES</b>			
Office of Defense Transportation	40	41	+1
Office of Scientific Research and Development	58	48	-10
Office of Selective Service Records	661	659	-2
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Council of Economic Advisers	59	59	—
National Security Council		4	+4
National Security Resources Board	44	51	+7
Office of Government Reports	20	19	-1
Office of the Housing Expediter	5,347	4,802	-545
Philippine Alien Property Administration	164	170	+6
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,378	4,663	+285
War Assets Administration	33,729	32,456	-1,273
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission	99	99	—
Bureau of the Budget	606	599	-7
Civil Aeronautics Board	570	573	+3
Civil Service Commission	3,613	3,668	+55
Export-Import Bank of Washington	113	116	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,301	1,303	+2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,164	1,173	+9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	360	—

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued</b>			
Federal Power Commission	774	780	+6
Federal Security Agency	32,368	32,394	+26
Federal Trade Commission	558	559	+1
Federal Works Agency	23,118	23,043	-75
General Accounting Office	9,969	9,529	-449
Government Printing Office	7,539	7,578	+39
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,514	12,336	-178
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,264	2,255	-9
Maritime Commission	6,838	6,913	+75
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,023	6,048	+25
National Archives	328	326	-2
National Capital Housing Authority	278	287	+9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	21	+2
National Gallery of Art	317	318	+1
National Labor Relations Board	849	788	-61
National Mediation Board	103	102	-1
Panama Canal	24,252	24,126	-126
Railroad Retirement Board	2,841	2,811	-30
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,826	6,619	-207
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,179	1,180	+1
Smithsonian Institution	522	522	—
Tariff Commission	225	224	-1
Tax Court of the United States	125	124	-1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,649	14,514	-135
Veterans' Administration	208,647	208,669	+22
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,172,705	1,168,776	-3,929
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			-3,929
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Office of Secretary of Defense	433	455	+22
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	252,878	255,142	+2,264
Outside continental United States	137,528	125,042	-12,486
Department of the Navy: Inside continental United States	340,150	339,219	-931
Outside continental United States	110,305	111,229	+924
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,014,008	1,999,853	-14,155
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			-14,145

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted from the previously reported figure of 22,517.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Commerce	1,139	1,087	-52
Interior	6,298	6,033	-265
State	318	343	+25
Treasury	3,835	3,628	-207

**TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, a comparison with October 1947—Continued**

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission-----	301	286	-
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
Housing and Home Finance Agency-----	5	3	-
Panama Canal-----	2, 127	2, 114	-
Tennessee Valley Authority-----	7, 779	7, 724	-
Total, excluding National Military Establishment-----	21, 742	21, 218	{ -
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment-----			-
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Department of the Army:			
Inside continental United States <sup>1</sup> -----	195, 213	197, 221	+2,
Outside continental United States-----	107, 652	95, 009	-12,
Department of the Navy-----	237, 264	236, 481	-
Total, including National Military Establishment-----	561, 871	549, 929	{ -13,
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment-----			{ +2,
			-11,

<sup>1</sup> Including Air Force industrial employees. For month of November, the Air Force employed 95 industrial workers.

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES**

Although civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government dropped during November to below 2,000,000 for the first time since 1941, more than half of the agencies reporting to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures showed employment increases inside continental United States.

Fifty-six reporting agencies certified a total civilian employment in November of 1,999,800, a net reduction of 14,145 under the total of the preceding month of October, but increases in nonmilitary employment inside the country were reported by 29 agencies.

The major portion of the net reduction was accounted for by a decrease of 12,643 civilian industrial personnel employed by the Army overseas. This reduction was said to have been occasioned largely by the discontinuance of the Mediterranean theater operations, but it was partially offset by an increase of 2,264 civilian employees taken by the Army inside the United States.

Continuing the unbroken trend of both the Army and the Air Force since the military unification law became effective last summer, the civilian employment of the Air Force also increased in November by 924.

Other agencies reporting major increases inside the country included the Interior, Justice, and Post Office Departments, Atomic Energy Commission, Civil Service Commission, and the Maritime Commission. Other agencies reported smaller increases.

Those reporting substantial decreases included Agriculture, Treasury, and Navy Departments, Office of Housing Expediter, Veterans Assets Administration, General Accounting Office, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Panama Canal, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Tennessee Valley Authority.



operation of the hospitals and in the conservation of the health of the Indians of Alaska than under the present system.

The repeal of the Wheeler-Howard Act as it applies to Alaska is imperative in order that Alaska may be developed. The said Wheeler-Howard Act provides for creation of Indian reservations by the Secretary of the Interior with approval by the Indians, and that such reservations shall not be allotted in severalty to any Indian.

Under authority of the Wheeler-Howard Act, large areas in Alaska comprising more than a million and a half acres have been set aside and created as Indian reservations. Proposals for creation of additional Indian reservations in Alaska, totaling millions of additional acres, are now under consideration by the Interior Department.

The Indian people of Alaska through their organization, the Alaska Native Brotherhood, have gone on record against reservations.

The Indians or natives of Alaska get along very well with the other citizens. Some of these Indians are leading businessmen of their communities; others earn above the average annual income for Alaska residents and are fully capable of managing their own affairs. Many have been and are members of the Territorial legislature.

The excellent relationship between the Indians or natives of Alaska is evidenced by the fact that the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, on February 16, 1945, enacted the so-called equal rights law, which provides:

SECTION 1. All citizens within the jurisdiction of the Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of public inns, restaurants, eating houses, hotels, soda fountains, soft drink parlors, taverns, roadhouses, barber shops, beauty parlors, bathrooms, resthouses, theaters, skating rinks, cafes, ice cream parlors, transportation companies, and all other conveyances and amusements, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to all citizens.

SEC. 2. Any person who shall violate or aid or incite a violation of said full and equal enjoyment; or any person who shall display any printed or written sign indicating a discrimination on racial grounds of said full and equal enjoyment, for each day for which said sign is displayed shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished or imprisoned in jail for not more than 30 days or fined not more than \$250, or both.

This would indicate that there is no discrimination or segregation of the Indians of Alaska.

The solution of the Indian problem in Alaska is not to set them apart from the other people or from modern life, but to give them the tools with which to compete on an equal footing with other people.

Education and equal opportunity with other people of Alaska is the solution of the Alaskan Indian problem.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Nebraska proposes that the Indians in Alaska be treated differently from the Indians in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. I would say that the Indians of Alaska come in a different category from the Indians in the States. Our relationship with the Indians in the States is controlled by treaties which are provided for in the Constitution of the United States. There is no such provision with relation to the Indians of Alaska, and therefore we are attempting to act on the Alaska Indian situation separately from the situation of the Indians in the States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call attention to the fact that there are approximately 12,000 employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the present time, and we are trying to get rid of thousands of them. I particularly call attention to the Indians of Oregon, especially those at Klamath Falls. There is a school there—I think it is called the Sherman School—where in my opinion the situation is deplorable.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. President, for the fine job he is doing in connection with the Indians in Alaska, but I hope it will include all the Indians in the United States of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from North Dakota in regard to commending the Senator from Nebraska for the points he has just made on the floor of the Senate with regard to the Alaskan Indian problem. I also wish the record to show that I share the views of the Senator from North Dakota in regard to the need for immediate action in connection with the problems of the Klamath Indians.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I may say that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, in charge of the Senate from Utah [Mr. WARREN], has under consideration—and we hope for action on at least one of the proposals—the liberation or the emancipation, if you will, of certain Indian tribes, in cases in which it has been publicly admitted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that they are ready for emancipation; and let me point out that the tribe to which both Senators have referred, namely, the Klamath Indians, is one of that group.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2037) to transfer to the Territorial government of Alaska the administration within such Territory of laws relating to Indians, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, except as provided in section 2, (a) all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of the Interior

and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with respect to the administration, within the Territory of Alaska, of laws relating to Indians are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by or under the direction of the Territorial government of Alaska.

(b) All records and property of the Department of the Interior or the Office of Indian Affairs used primarily in the exercise of powers, duties, and functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby transferred to the Territorial government of Alaska.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use in the exercise of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby made available to the Territorial government of Alaska for carrying out such functions.

(d) This section shall become effective on the first day of April 1949.

SEC. 2. (a) All functions, responsibilities, and duties of the Secretary of the Interior, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the maintenance and operation of hospitals in the Territory of Alaska and the conservation of the health of Indians in such Territory are hereby transferred to and shall be administered by the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General, respectively.

(b) All personnel, records, and property (including office equipment) of the Office of Indian Affairs or the Department of the Interior used primarily in the performance of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby transferred to the Public Health Service.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the Department of the Interior or the Office of Indian Affairs in the exercise of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby made available to the Public Health Service for use in carrying out such functions.

(d) This section shall become effective on the first day of April 1949.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Territorial government of Alaska such sums as may be necessary to enable such government to provide education for children of Indians, Eskimos, and other natives of Alaska.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 13 of the act entitled "An act to conserve and develop Indian lands and resources; to extend to Indians the right to form business and other organizations; to establish a credit system for Indians; to grant certain rights of home rule to Indians; to provide for vocational education for Indians; and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), is amended by striking out the following: "except that sections 9, 10, 11, 12, and 16 shall apply to the Territory of Alaska."

(b) Section 19 of such act of June 18, 1934, is amended by striking out the following: "For the purpose of this act Eskimos and other aboriginal peoples of Alaska shall be considered Indians."

(c) The act entitled "An act to extend certain provisions of the act approved June 18, 1934, commonly known as the Wheeler-Howard Act (Public Law No. 383, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 984), to the Territory of Alaska, to provide for the designation of Indian reservations in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), is hereby repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Indian Affairs originally opposed the emancipation or liberation of any tribe of Indians; and it was only after long hearings that the Indian Bureau finally agreed to the emancipation or liberation of 10 tribes. However, I call attention to the fact that instead of only 10 tribes, in my opinion there are

at least 20 tribes, including at least 2 tribes in North Dakota, that at the present time are ready for emancipation, just as the Klamath Indians in Oregon are. I hope that when the Indian Bureau states that only 10 tribes—some in California and some in other places—are ready for emancipation at the present time, the distinguished Senator will carefully look into the situation of other tribes, because I think if he does so, he will find that a number of other tribes are likewise ready for emancipation today.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for the interest he has shown and the effective work he did as a member of this committee and also under the committees existing under the former committee organization of the Senate, and I also commend him for the continued interest he maintains in all affairs relating to the emancipation of the Indians in the United States. The solution of this question should be arrived at as quickly as is possible, without further delay.

#### STANDARD TIME

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that the standard time now prevailing throughout the United States shall be used in connection with all business affecting commerce and also affecting all offices and departments of the United States Government, legislative, judicial, and executive. This bill is intended by me as a counterattack against the daylight savings bill for the District of Columbia which was enacted last March. It was not observed by the railroads or other common carriers. It is opposed by the National Association of Broadcasters, and most of the district committees of that association have gone on record in opposition. It has produced much confusion and much trouble.

We should have a regular standard time prevailing throughout the United States, and that is the purpose I have in offering this bill. I wish to have it appropriately referred, and I should like to have it acted upon as soon as possible.

The bill (S. 2041) to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to require that the standard times fixed therein shall be used in connection with all businesses affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. OVERTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which provides for the creation of a commission of 24 members to arrange for and to carry out the observance of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Interior.

The Commission would be composed of the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the respective chairmen of the Public Lands Committees of the two Houses, six other members of each of

these committees appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively, and six distinguished citizens appointed by the President.

The Commission is directed to make a report to the Nation of 100 years' stewardship of its natural resources, their exploration and conservation, their present condition and extent, and their future availability and development.

The Commission is also directed to prepare plans for the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Department, and to make a report to the Congress not later than May 15, 1948, in order that any legislation necessary to enable it to carry out its plans may be enacted.

An appropriation is authorized to defray the expenses of the Commission.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 175) providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Interior as an executive department of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. HATCH), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by Senator WHERRY relating to the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress, before a meeting of the Republican National Committee, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by Senator KNOWLAND on January 19, 1948, at the dinner of the Republican National Committee, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE LYNCHBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Lynchburg, Va., on January 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM LELAND OLDS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TAX ON VEGETABLE OILS—LETTER FROM H. K. THATCHER

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the

Record a letter relative to tax on vegetable oils, addressed to him under date of January 16, 1948, by Mr. H. K. Thatcher, director of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE CASE AGAINST COMPULSORY ARBITRATION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Arbitration," written by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY THE POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement relating to development of the St. Lawrence seaway, issued by the Power Authority of the State of New York January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COMMUNISM DEFINED—EDITORIAL FROM THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NEWS OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Defines Communism," published in the Young Republican News of Washington, D. C., of January 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONSTITUTION IS IGNORED IN CIVIL RIGHTS HYSTERIA—ARTICLE BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Constitution Is Ignored in Civil Rights Hysteria," by Donald R. Richberg, published in the Washington Star of January 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following House bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poortvliet;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reves;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnatos or Tom Panage Yanatos);



H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer;  
 H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;  
 H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;  
 H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;  
 H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerd; Hulzonga;  
 H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;  
 H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;  
 H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;  
 H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;  
 H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;  
 H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;  
 H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;  
 H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetunearo;  
 H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;  
 H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;  
 H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Vidulich;  
 H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;  
 H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;  
 H. R. 3061. An act for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski);  
 H. R. 3067. An act for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell;  
 H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mae H. Fitzgerald;  
 H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;  
 H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;  
 H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;  
 H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy;  
 H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;  
 H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25);  
 H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;  
 H. R. 3930. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act;  
 H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;  
 H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers; and  
 H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Valda, Elena Valda, and Stefano Valda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;  
 H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; and  
 H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.  
 H. R. 1809. An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3538. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; and

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3814. An act to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 4141. An act to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively. Previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1948.

#### AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS FOR SOLDIERS' HOME, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 929) to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564), which was, in line 11, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, when the Senate passed Senate bill 929, the bill inadvertently named the Secretary of War, instead of giving the correct name, "Secretary of the Army." Therefore this amendment is necessary.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EVA L. DUDLEY ET AL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. McCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, inasmuch as we have a unanimous-consent agreement that it shall be called next Monday for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, starting with No. 863, where the consideration of calendar measures was concluded on January 12.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONTROL OF USE OF GRAIN FOR PRODUCTION OF SPIRITS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am taking the floor at this time to ask for the immediate passage by the Senate of Senate bill 1842, a bill to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency last December.

As originally introduced, the bill would have amended the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, approved July 15, 1947, by adding to section 3 of that act a new subsection 1501 (b) (1) (g). This new subsection would have added grain to the enumerated articles that are not decontrolled under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Therefore it would have recon- trolled grain by adding to the controlled items the following language:

(G) Grain, except grain on the farm where raised and except that no grain may be allocated or released, and no grain or grain products may be used, for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, including whisky, unless the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall find that the amount of grain available for more essential domestic uses and for exports to carry out the foreign policy of the United States is such that grain can safely be made available for distilled spirits, in which event the President may authorize the use of grain from time to time for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes for limited, specified periods of time. In considering the relative essentiality of uses of grain, consideration shall be given to the availability of adequate supplies of distilled spirits.

Mr. President, this bill went to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

FLANDERS] was appointed chairman of a subcommittee to consider the matter. There is wide interest in the proposed legislation. Under the present law, the President will have the powers specified until January 30. That fact indicated the need of haste in holding hearings on this very complex subject. It is the opinion of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as expressed through its chairman, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], that adequate hearings should be allowed, in order to be fair to all interested parties. Therefore, in this situation, the Committee on Banking and Currency met and unanimously approved a bill extending for 30 days the time the President now has, and the 30 days will be used in order to afford full and fair hearing to all interested parties.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am making a motion that the bill be taken up at this time for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will not withhold his motion, in view of the fact that the bill will be placed on the calendar, and will be up for consideration Monday. That will give ample time for those who have not had an opportunity to consider the matter to look into it. As I understand, the bill provides only for the extension of the President's authority for 30 days.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct. All interested parties have expressed agreement in the proposal. It relieves their minds, because they will have this time for hearings on this complex subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair points out that the bill was reported Monday, and is on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it is on the calendar.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask that it be taken up at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator say it meets the approval of all the distilling interests, as well as others?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Vermont advised me that the day the hearing was held the distillery interests had asked for more time, and in view of that he asked for 30 days more.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be very unfair to take this bill up without further consideration. I do not know whether I would be against it or for it, but this is the situation: Without hearings, in December we imposed a restriction on the particular industry here involved, without giving the members of that industry a chance for a single hearing. I advocated the action myself, because we were right up against the deadline and the necessity for action within 1 or 2 days. But it does seem to me that there is enough time between now and February 1 to have full hearings, and that we should hold hearings and take action before the 1st of February after the hearings have been held.

I do not care to say absolutely that I would not vote for the bill, but I think it merits more consideration than merely taking it up and passing it without con-

sideration of any kind by the Senate. The distillers seem to be completely divided. None of them can agree with others, so far as I can discover. I do not know whether they should have a particular form of allocation, whether Mr. Anderson's form of allocation is fair or not fair. I think the committee should try to afford hearings before February 1, so that we may act intelligently. The House must act, and, I think certainly the House is not going to act before Monday, if the Senator will let it go over until Monday. That is my own impression at the present time from the way the Banking and Currency Committee of the House is proceeding.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from North Dakota to ask a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I received a telephone call from the distillers, who are having a meeting in Minneapolis, informing me that they want to be heard. I do not know which side I am going to be on.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the Senator that it is just such considerations that motivate the committee. In response to the comments of the distinguished leader from Ohio, the time between now and February 1 is 10 days. The Committee on Banking and Currency is overwhelmed with the magnitude and the amount of legislative matters under consideration. We are working. We are to hold a night session tomorrow night. To ask that this bill go over now is unfair and unjust to the committee. If there are any interests to be affected, there is to be a 30-day period for extended hearings, for the very purpose the Senator from Ohio mentions, namely, so that all parties can be heard. That is the primary purpose of the bill. It is the unanimous consensus of the Committee on Banking and Currency that that is the wise procedure, in view of all they have to do, to conserve the rights of the people who are interested. I yield further to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think the members of the industry ought to be heard? They are meeting at Minneapolis.

Mr. TOBEY. That is just exactly why we are postponing the matter, so they can be heard. That is the purpose.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator is not so very busy, I wonder if he would take up that \$10,000 bill of mine for hearing.

Mr. TOBEY. We cannot take up anything so small as \$10,000. We deal only in millions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement made by the Senator from Ohio. As a matter of fact, hearings were set down in the subcommittee for yesterday. I represent a State whose people are vitally interested in this legislation. A request was made for a postponement of the hearing from yesterday, because of the short notice. The hearing was called anyway, and a good many of those who wanted to be heard came on to Washington. On

yesterday, or the day before yesterday, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], chairman of the subcommittee, decided to postpone the hearing, because there was not sufficient time to have a full hearing between now and the 1st day of February, and he proposed the extension now sought.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not intentionally make a misstatement, but it is not accurate to say that all interests have agreed on this 30-day extension, even. Whether it would be possible to hold a comprehensive hearing between now and the 1st day of February is problematical. That is only 10 days off. The suggestion has been made by the particular industry involved even in this extension, that the power to allocate be extended to other beverage industries besides merely the distilled-beverage industry, to include industrial alcohol or beer or other forms of distilled or fermented liquors that are made from grain. I think they would like to present that viewpoint to the committee. Whether the committee would adopt it is a matter about which I express no opinion. But if the Senator undertakes to get this bill up today, it will undoubtedly arouse controversy, and also uncertainty as to whether it ought to be amended, to what extent it ought to be amended, whether for the 30-day period, even, because when we passed it in December, it was only for a 30-day period, practically speaking. It is to expire on the 31st day of this month, which is now 10 days hence. But the extension the Senator proposes is no more than the provision in the bill that was adopted here in the latter part of December, which provided that the law should expire on the 31st day of January. So what the Senator is really doing is practically asking now, without a hearing and without much debate or consideration or opportunity to be heard, for an extension practically equal to the provision of the law as it was adopted in December. I think that to try to get the bill up today might be a little unfair to some of us who perhaps do not know exactly the extent to which the time ought to be extended, or how much should be covered in the extension.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator from Kentucky finished?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have concluded for the moment. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I am on the subcommittee to which this matter was referred. It was first proposed that we have hearings on Thursday or Friday of this week. We felt that if we did, we could not complete them in 1 day, that time was of the essence, and that we would not get any legislation through in time to meet the dead line of January 31. We had already gone into the matter very fully. We knew that 85 percent of the consumption now is bourbon whisky, which is made primarily from corn, with some wheat and rye mixed; that corn was critically short; there could not be any argument,



about corn being short. We then said we would have hearings for 1 day, on Tuesday, which was yesterday. Numerous representatives of the industry complained that they could not adequately present their viewpoint in 1 day. Unfortunately, one member of our subcommittee had to be out of the city this week. The chairman and I wanted to accommodate him in the fullest way. In deference to his wishes, and to afford an adequate hearing to a large industry, some elements of which did not want any control at all, others of which wanted proper standards written into the act, to bring it more in line with decisions of the Supreme Court in NRA and similar cases, wherein they said the Congress had not set up proper standards, we decided there was but one practical thing to do, and that was to continue an emergency control for 1 month. That is a short month, even though it falls in a leap year. That would give us time to hear adequately the viewpoint of the distillers.

Mr. President, I think I am sufficiently familiar with the viewpoint of the American people, and I can say, I think, without successful contradiction, that the overwhelming majority of them want us to put food first in the present emergency. There are in bonded warehouses now 480,000,000 gallons of whisky. There are 60,000,000 gallons of neutral spirits. The distillers last year made twice as much whisky as they sold. They have a supply, on the basis of the present consumption of about 60,000,000 gallons a year, that will last 5 or 6 years. The distilling interests were shut down completely for 22 months during the war, and yet during that period and the succeeding period they made unprecedented profits. I think it would be the most selfish and most unpatriotic attitude for any distilling interests—and I can only say it does not represent all of them—not to be willing to make any concession to this emergency for food and especially for corn, the scarcity of which no one can deny. I understand that the allocation now being made by the Secretary of Agriculture is adequate to produce all the whisky the country will consume, and that the restrictions will not unduly depress the profits of the operations of the industry. So I hope very much my distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky, will not attempt to block consideration of this 30-day extension. When the bill was passed last month, I do not believe there was a dissenting voice in this entire body. I have never heard anybody say, "I want the distillers to use all the corn they want, it does not make any difference whether you can feed your cattle, or whether you have corn bread, or how much wheat would have to be diverted; I want the distilleries to run; I want them to make twice as much whisky as they can sell; I want them to pile it up; in their warehouses, where they have 480,000,000 gallons, let them put 580,000,000 gallons; we must fill these warehouses."

The point I wish to mention now is that during the war emergency it was not possible to get new oak-stave barrels, which are necessary for the aging

of that superior product which is manufactured in the State of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. So about 100,000,000 gallons of whisky were put in old whisky barrels, the char of which had already become so soaked with fusel oil that it would not properly age the whisky in those barrels. The producers cannot sell that whisky now under the established brands, because it is not the same kind of whisky. The pure-food laws will not permit the producers to sell that whisky under the established brand names. The only practical way to utilize that 100,000,000 gallons of whisky, which is more than a year's supply, is to redistill it, and when that whisky is redistilled and the pure alcohol gotten out again, if they want to, they can use it in blended whisky, which some say the majority of the people now prefer, because it is a light-bodied whisky and has a flavor to which people became educated when bonded whisky was sold at such a high price, and the producers learned to put a quart of whisky in a fifth bottle. That 100,000,000 gallons would take care of all visible needs.

I hope very much, Mr. President, that our distinguished majority leader will recognize the position in which the subcommittee is placed. We are trying to do what is best for the Senate and for the Congress and for the people of this Nation. We do not want to work any injustice on any industrial group, but we do want to put first things first. That would be to put our need for food above our need for liquor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield gladly to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend that the Senator from Virginia shall put me in the attitude of standing here and advocating the manufacture of liquor as opposed to bread. I do not think anything I ever did or said justifies the imputation to me of any such preference.

Mr. President, discussion of this subject came up in December. The manufacture of whisky is a very technical procedure. The difference between bonded whisky and blended whisky, and whisky made with neutral spirits, in which a comparatively small proportion of whisky may go into the blend, and all of that, is a very technical matter. When the subject came up in December I offered an amendment, which I thought would cure a situation that might operate as a loophole, by including neutral spirits also in the power to allocate grain for manufacture. The amendment was placed in the bill on the floor without very much consideration. Whether it was adequate or whether it met the situation I am still a little undecided. But since authority to allocate has been in effect, there has been a suggestion that other forms of alcoholic beverage ought to be included. I do not know whether they ought to be or not. I am not in possession of sufficient information to enable me to present an amendment which has been suggested at least by some of those who are affected by the allocation.

I am not seeking in any way to block the legislation. I do not think any harm would come if it went over a day or two so that we might look into the wisdom of offering some amendment here, rather than be compelled to take the bill as it is.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me so that I may make an explanation to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, please.

Long before any agreement was entered into about the shutting down of the distilling industry, many of the distilling interests in the State which I happen to represent entered into a voluntary shut-down agreement themselves. They did so months in advance of the agreement that was entered into generally throughout the country. They have undertaken honestly and patriotically to observe and live up to every requirement. Whether they made money during the 2-year period when they were operating about 6 days a month I do not know. I have not looked into that, and I am not in any position to say whether they did or did not. But if we are going to conserve food, and grain that goes into food, there certainly is nothing insidious about a suggestion that all forms of liquor which consume the grain that goes into food, might well be considered.

The only thing I had in mind by following the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was the first to speak on the subject, was that there might be a legitimate reason for giving a day or 2 days to look into the question to see whether the authority should be extended as it is, or whether the law should be amended so as to include other forms of grain consumed in the making of liquor.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield further, I might say in that connection that since the allocation was made under the law as it now exists, one very large distilling interest in this country has brought a lawsuit in the Federal court to attack the constitutionality of even the 30 days' provision which was in the legislation passed in December. I do not know what will be the result of that litigation. I do not think that one particular interest represents the general body of those engaged in the industry. That particular interest has a right to bring a lawsuit, which I suppose it will be decided some time in the future, perhaps too late to be of any value in the present situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to clarify one statement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky that he knows that I not only

admire him, but I love him, and I would be the last individual in the world to say anything from which any inference might be drawn that I was placing him in the position of putting liquor above food. That was not my intention at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Virginia meant no such implication.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Oh, absolutely not.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I appreciate his statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There was only one thing I wanted to develop. Unfortunately, I did not hear the opening statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the first statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], but, as a member of the subcommittee, I wanted to impress upon the Senate the fact that if it were proposed that the subcommittee should hear the witnesses who desired to be heard, and to consider all the phases which we think properly should be considered of legislation which would extend this measure until the new corn crop comes in in the fall of 1948, we could not do that in time to complete action on the legislation in January.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say, Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky proceeds further, that I appreciate that all the Senator has said was said absolutely in good faith and in all sincerity. But he is arguing the matter of control of grain for distilling purposes. That is not the purpose of the measure which is before us today. Naturally the committee of the Senate responsible for the subject matter, burdened with other work as it was, found the congestion such that in an important matter such as this there was not adequate time between now and February 1, 10 days, to give all the people interested in this salient matter the opportunity to present their cases. So, under the jurisdiction of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is now in the Chamber, a hurried meeting was called, the Senator placed the situation before the subcommittee, and the subcommittee voted unanimously to ask that the matter go over for 30 days more, which will give sufficient time for all interested parties to come and be heard fully, with justice to all. That, Mr. President, is all there is to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that situation. I have not for a long time been a member of the distinguished committee now presided over by the Senator from New Hampshire. I know with what sincerity it approaches every subject with which it deals. It was contemplated last week, however, when the hearing was set down for yesterday, that there would be such a hearing conducted as would enable the committee to act permanently on the subject, and not simply for 30 days. It developed that that was not sufficient time.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And as between the program of continuing the legislation

indefinitely without an adequate hearing, and the proposal now submitted to the Senate, I think the latter is preferable, although it was not expected that the subject would be brought up today, and it might make it difficult, without adequate information, for Members of the Senate who in good faith may want to suggest an amendment or two, to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, all Senators will have an opportunity to offer amendments when the bill is reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, the permanent legislation. I am speaking now of the 30-day proposal.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the House is concerned, I have no information as to whether it will or will not act. Last week I received 150 to 250 telegrams with reference to a Morton bill which had been introduced in the House of Representatives by a Member of the House from the State of Kentucky, requesting information as to when hearings would be had on the Morton bill. I have no information about when hearings will be had on that bill. I tried to find out from the author and from the committee of the House, and so far as they know, no hearings are scheduled on the Morton bill or any other bill on the subject, and whether there are to be any hearings or whether any action will be taken on the bill I do not think anyone knows.

Mr. TOBEY. That is not our responsibility, of course.

Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be inserted a statement which I had prepared, and also two paragraphs from a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. N. E. Dodd, bearing on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement and the extracts from the letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On December 15, 1947, S. 1842 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As originally introduced, S. 1842 would have amended the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, approved July 15, 1947, by adding to section 3 of that act a new subsection 1501 (b) (1) (g). This new subsection would have added grain to the enumerated articles that are not decontrolled under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Therefore, it would have recontrolled grain by adding to the controlled items the following language:

"(G) Grain, except grain on the farm where raised, and except that no grain may be allocated or released, and no grain or grain products may be used, for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, including whisky, unless the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall find that the amount of grain available for more essential domestic uses and for exports to carry out the foreign policy of the United States is such that grain can safely be made available for distilled spirits, in which event the President may authorize the use of grain from time to time for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes for limited, specified periods of time. In considering the relative essentiality of uses of grain, consideration shall be given to the availability of adequate supplies of distilled spirits."

As S. 1842 was referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on December

15, 1947, there remained very little time to act upon it before the end of the special session. On December 16, 1947, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported Senate Joint Resolution 167 and added an amendment to section 4 of the joint resolution by adding a new subsection (b), which revived and reenacted the original authority vested in the President by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942. However, it limited such authority to the allocation of grain for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes. The authority invested in the President was made to expire on January 31, 1948. When Senate Joint Resolution 167 was taken up on the floor of the Senate, the Senate added the words "neutral spirits" so that the authority conferred on the President was enlarged to control over the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes. Senate Joint Resolution 167 as enacted by the Senate and by the House contained that language.

The Banking and Currency Committee gave early consideration to S. 1842 at the opening of this present session. It was apparent that the period, during which the use of grain for the production of distilled or neutral spirits for beverage purposes might be controlled, would have to be extended. On January 12, 1948, during a hearing upon stabilization measures, I asked Secretary Clinton P. Anderson the following question:

"As a result of your experience in imposing restraints on the use of grain for distilling of neutral spirits, and for beverage purposes, what is your opinion of the need for extension of the allocation and rationing power for that purpose?"

Secretary Anderson's reply was as follows:

"I think it is necessary to continue the allocation and rationing power on the distilled spirits. I only point out the fact that I limited them to about 2,500,000 bushels, and I think unrestrained they would have used at least 7,500,000 bushels; and possibly more, of grain during the same period. I think the saving of that 5,000,000 bushels is important."

It became evident that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee would need more time to consider the matter of grain allocations. S. 1842 would authorize the allocation of grain for all purposes, except that it would not allow allocation of grain where raised. It would set up new rules with respect to the allocation of grain for the use of distilled spirits for beverage purposes. As S. 1842 would take the form of an amendment to the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, it would expire on February 29, 1948, along with that act.

S. 1842 would provide for the controlling of grain for a 1-month period only. It would require complex regulations that could not be set up in time to take effect during that 1-month period. The question whether grain should be allocated for all purposes would require longer hearings than could possibly be held before the termination of the present law on this subject (January 31, 1948). The committee has received a flood of requests from witnesses who wish to testify on this matter.

Accordingly, the committee has without objection agreed to continue section 4 of the present law (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.) for an additional month by making the termination date of the present law February 29, 1948. This was done in order to afford this committee the opportunity to consider the subject matter of S. 1842 in connection with general allocations before the expiration date of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (February 29, 1948). To accomplish this, the committee has amended S. 1842 in the following respects:

"First committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:



"That section 4 (b) of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out 'January 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 29, 1948'."

Second committee amendment: Amend the title so as to read:

"A bill to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942."

To summarize in a few words, the effect of S. 1842, as reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, is to continue the present law which vests authority in the President to allocate grain for the production of distilled or neutral spirits for beverage purposes, for 1 month by making the termination date of the present law February 29, 1948, instead of January 31, 1948, so that the Banking and Currency Committee may hear more witnesses upon this matter.

[Extract from letter of N. E. Dodd, Acting Secretary of Agriculture]

JANUARY 21, 1948.

This is in reply to your telephone request of January 20 for a statement with respect to S. 1842, reported out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, with amendments. As amended, the bill extends until February 29, 1948, the provisions of section 4 (b) of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, first session. This section authorizes the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by title III of the Second War Powers Act, with respect to the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes.

As you know, grain continues to be in critically short supply, and its conservation is a matter of urgent necessity in order that the most essential domestic requirements be met first and in order that the United States be in a position to fulfill commitments made pursuant to our foreign policy. During the fiscal year 1947 the distilling industry used approximately 59,000,000 bushels of grain. From information now available to us it is estimated that in the absence of controls distillers would use at least 7,500,000 bushels of grain per month. By virtue of the allocation order now in effect, issued under section 4 (b) of Public Law 395, approximately 2,500,000 bushels of grain are allocated to the distilling industry for the month of January. It is imperative that distillers limit their use of grain during the next few months. Since the distilling industry is unable to agree upon any plan of voluntary allocation, it is our opinion that statutory authority for that purpose, is provided in S. 1842, as amended.

Mr. FLANDERS rose.

Mr. TOBEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from New Hampshire yielding for an inquiry or surrendering the floor?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me put it this way: The Senator from Vermont was called away from the Chamber in an emergency. He came to me and asked me, as a brother Senator and as a member of his committee, if I would be good enough to present this matter. I have done so in my humble way. Under the whip and spur of the agitation which has arisen in the Senate today on this ques-

tion, he has patriotically and unselfishly returned to the Chamber and is now present. I ask him to speak for himself as chairman of the subcommittee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, the Chair does not care to surrender the power of the Chair to recognize Senators. A Senator has a perfect right to yield for a question, if a question is addressed to him.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield for a question; and I suggest that the question be, "How are you doing?"

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that we should adhere to the rules relative to yielding the floor. I do not wish to take the Senator from New Hampshire from the floor. He can present his case if he cares to do so. I asked him in the beginning if he would withdraw his motion, feeling that there would be no debate on the issue, and that the bill would undoubtedly be passed on Monday. That is the easiest way to expedite the procedure. If we are to have a full-dress debate, I think in fairness to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the chairman of the subcommittee, we should have a quorum call and debate the question, because we would require a quorum before taking a vote on the question. In view of what has been said by the distinguished Senator who is working so hard on this committee, that the report is unanimous, that there will be no debate upon it, and that the bill will pass, I ask the Senator if he will not permit the bill to come up on the call of the calendar on Monday. If he feels that he cannot do so, I think the only thing to do is to have a quorum call and a debate on the question whether or not we are to take up this proposed legislation ahead of other legislation with respect to which certain plans have been announced to the Senate, and upon which Members of the Senate have informed themselves.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if I were commenting on the proceedings here today, I would say, in the language of Holy Writ, "How great a matter a little fire kindleth."

I submit to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from New Hampshire is doing a perfectly natural thing. When the Senator who asked him to present the case now returns to the Chamber, he should have the courtesy of making a few remarks on this question. So I yield to my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. He may ask a formal question, and he may ask additional questions; but I think the courteous thing to do is to allow him to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with, because I feel that an arrangement has been made which will be satisfactory relative to calling up the bill which has been discussed. It is the

intention to ask unanimous consent, before the close of business today, that the civil service bill, Senate bill 637, be made the unfinished business. I have been in touch with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] who has agreed that on Friday, when that bill comes up for consideration, he will not object to a motion to set it aside temporarily until the question just discussed has been settled. If that is in agreement with the understanding of the Senator from North Dakota and of the Senator from New Hampshire, I suggest that we proceed on that basis.

Mr. TOBEY. That is agreeable to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the suspension of further proceedings under the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today Calendar No. 144, Senate bill 637, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, be made the unfinished business, and that it be understood that when the Senate convenes on Friday following the recess, the unfinished business, which will then be Senate bill 637, will be temporarily set aside for the consideration of Senate bill 1842.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the Kilgore-Aiken bill, that the Senate defer considering it until Friday.

#### EUROPEAN FEDERATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 20, Mr. Foster Dulles, appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, made a powerful and, I believe, unanswerable argument that this country should encourage the unity of Europe. I hope all the Members of the Senate will take the time to read Mr. Dulles' statement before the committee. His emphasis is noteworthy, and the several points which he brought out in his speech, particularly that as to the attitude this Government ought to take toward the creation of a federated Europe, I think are worthy of study by every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, on Monday last Mr. Bernard Baruch, one of our country's wisest elder statesmen, also recognized the importance of promoting the unification of Europe. Also on Monday, Mr. Drew Pearson, in an article entitled "U. S. of Europe Held Only Solution," presented powerful arguments in favor of a federation of Europe. The Times-Herald, of Washington, which is not generally regarded as being idealistic in its approach to international matters, expressed similar views on Saturday, January 17, in an editorial entitled, "Europe Needs a United States." This morning the Washington Post commented favorably again, as it has many times in the past, on the subject of European unity.

These expressions are the most recent, but by no means the only, support that has been given the idea of European federation during the past year. It is significant that the only strong and bitter opposition to European federation comes from the Communists. That in itself should be persuasive to those among us who are too busy to take the time to study the affirmative reasons for federation.

Mr. President, in order to refresh the memory of the Members of the Senate and of the people, I wish to point out that on March 21, 1947, the senior Senator from Utah and I introduced a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10, providing:

That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it rests today.

Following the introduction of the resolution, the press of this country commented on the proposal favorably. Practically all of the papers expressed their strong approval of the idea, but many felt that it could not be achieved because of the ancient prejudices and rivalries that have in the past kept the nations of Europe apart. Since that time, however, I think the actions of the Europeans themselves have gone far to dissipate this defeatism. The unprecedented response to Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard last June, by the 16 European nations, has brought the unification of Europe within the realm of possibility. Mr. Dulles, on Tuesday, had a great deal to say in answer to direct questions. He said positively he thought it possible to achieve the purpose within the near future, and that really all that was required was a "push," which I interpret to mean some encouragement from this country.

Secretary Marshall, in his statement at Harvard and in his letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, commenting on the resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) prior to his speech, seemed to recognize the importance of unification to the future of Europe. He stated in his letter of June 4, 1947, that he was "deeply sympathetic toward the general objective of the resolution." Since June, however, I have not seen any statement of the Secretary's or of any other important member of the administration, following up or developing this point. On the contrary, the usual discussions of the Marshall plan, in the press and by the people, have centered around the amounts involved the effect upon our economy, and, generally speaking, the view that it is a relief or reconstruction plan for the individual nations involved. In other words, the objective of a unified, federated Europe has been forgotten or overlooked.

Mr. President, for my own part, while I have made many speeches in support of the Marshall plan, I have done so because I believed that an indispensable consideration or objective of the plan was a federated Europe. If the same old prewar Europe of many impotent, independent states is rehabilitated, I do not think we shall have achieved anything of lasting value, or anything commensurate with the sacrifice that we shall

have made. To put it another way, unless our Government and the Europeans accept the idea that some form of political federation, as well as economic cooperation, is a proper objective of the Marshall plan, I shall have great difficulty in bringing myself to support the plan. If our Government is unwilling to recognize, and to accept, federation as a necessary and legitimate goal, I think the entire concept of European reconstruction is a futile gesture bound to result in disaster for Europe, as well as for ourselves.

My reasons for this conclusion are too involved to discuss in detail at this time, but I shall sum them up with this thought: If we reconstruct Europe within the framework of her medieval political and economic structure, and she does not achieve unity, she can protect herself from neither alien domination nor internal quarrels. Standing alone, none of the 16 nations can withstand the determined pressures of the Russians. While they think they can take refuge in neutrality, the last war has proved how futile that is. We cannot afford permanently to protect them from foreign domination. They must find a way to protect themselves and to stand on their own feet, economically.

If we reequip their industrial plants and they do not at the same time achieve federation, we are likely to find that very industrial power turned against us. How often have we regretted selling scrap iron to Japan before the last war. But that was nothing compared to the industrial power that we shall have furnished our opponents if Europe should succumb to Russia after we have rebuilt her under the Marshall plan.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Foreign Relations will incorporate in the bill that is reported to the Senate the sense of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. If it is overlooked by the committee, I intend to offer it as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. President, on December 9 and 10, I gave the Marfleet lectures at the University of Toronto. The subject of those lectures was the federation of Europe. In them I have attempted to give more fully the reasons why this country and our neighbors in the New World have a vital interest in seeing a strong, self-sufficient Europe created out of the chaos of the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the lectures be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE NEW WORLD LOOKS AT THE OLD WORLD

##### I

When the United Nations was created in 1945, we believed that, at long last, a rational world order was in the making. We remembered, of course, in our more thoughtful moments, that once before, in 1920, a former effort to bring peace to the world was fatally crippled by the absence of one of the great powers. But this time all the great powers are participants and we thought that people had surely learned something from the Second World War. Such does not seem to be the case. This time, instead of a refusal by

a great power to participate, we are confronted with a participant, relentless and aggressive in its efforts to obstruct and to destroy the effectiveness of the undertaking.

In view of the rather obvious fact that the United Nations cannot operate effectively under existing conditions, it seems to me the better part of wisdom for the people of the New World, particularly of your country and my country, to take a good look at the Old World and see if we cannot find a gleam of hope in that dismal scene. I do not suggest that we abandon the machinery or the concept of the United Nations. But I do suggest that, while that organization is temporarily stalemated, we should look elsewhere for the means to stop the persistent aggression of Russia and for a way to reestablish a semblance of order and freedom in the world.

In my own country we have, I think, finally recognized that appeasement and half measures lead only to futility and failure. As a result of Secretary Marshall's suggestion last June, we are developing slowly and painfully a positive and affirmative program to give the free peoples of western Europe an opportunity to rebuild their stricken countries, and thereby to avoid the tyranny of Russian domination. The so-called Marshall plan, as it is presently conceived, is the correct approach; but it alone is not enough to create a strong and stable community in Europe. Something new is needed. That something, I believe, is the federation of the nations of Europe.

It is my conviction that the New World can help Europe along the road to federation. Europe is ripe for a change. She has just passed through the most devastating war in history, which left chaos and discontent in its wake. Europe, at this moment, is wallowing in the backwash of the Second World War and needs help desperately; but, so long as Europe remains a senseless conglomeration of separate economic and political entities there is little hope for the peace and prosperity of Europe or of the world.

Very seldom, if ever, have people achieved any notable progress in their social or political structures just because it was the reasonable or wise thing to do. The progress they have made in these fields has usually resulted from a serious threat to their very survival. Social and political traditions are not easily changed by rational methods alone.

The most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval, which leaves it in an unstable and fluid state. At such a time vested interests disappear; the established order is disestablished; old prejudices soften as new ones begin to evolve; the old rulers lose their power to others; and new patterns of society begin to take shape. Thus, after the Thirty Years War, modern Europe began to emerge from medieval feudalism. After the Napoleonic conflicts, the concert of Europe and a multitude of peace organizations flourished. Out of the First World War came the League of Nations and out of the second, the United Nations.

As a result of the upheaval, from which she has not yet emerged, Europe as I have said, is ripe for a change. It is our job to see that the change is forward to a system of freedom and self-government, rather than backward to slavery and tyranny; forward to unity and peace, rather than to nationalistic particularism and impotent fragmentation which leads to war and probably to domination by an alien power.

The idea of a federation of Europe is not new. For centuries it has been advocated by some of the wisest men of the Western World. The point is that the circumstances of the present are more compelling, the necessity is greater, than at any time in history. No one has expressed this more eloquently than Winston Churchill when, at a meeting in London in May of this year, he said:

"This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe



resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

"This is the supreme opportunity, and, if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be \* \* \*.

"We hope to reach again a Europe purged of the slavery of ancient days in which men will be as proud to say, 'I am a European,' as they were to say, 'Civis romanus sum.' We hope to see a Europe where men of every country think as much of being a European as of belonging to their native land, and wherever they go in this wide domain will truly feel 'Here I am at home.'"

*Why it is important to us that Europe be united*

There are many reasons why it is to the interest of the Western Hemisphere that Europe should recreate the unity which, in ancient and medieval times, permitted her people to live in relative peace and happiness. Overshadowing all other considerations is the supreme interest that we have in creating a peaceful world. But there is also the hard, materialistic fact that we have made, and are committed to make additional, enormous loans and grants to the nations of Europe; and as a consequence we are faced with such a terrific drain upon our national resources through these services, that we are forced to take stock of our wealth lest we impoverish ourselves in helping the world. It would be strange if we did not take a selfish interest in the possibilities of a United States of Europe. But whatever malicious propaganda the Kremlin may spread to the contrary, the fact remains that the primary reason for our loans and grants is our wish to create a stable and orderly world in which we, and all peoples of the world, may live in peace. I am convinced that the uniting of Europe is a fundamental pillar of a stable world order.

Our concern is not simply an idealistic dream of bringing relief to suffering Europe; nor is it the hard-shelled manipulations of economic imperialism. We have a deep and inescapable interest in the welfare of Europe. Twice, in 25 years, we have shed our blood and spent our treasure in world wars which grew out of European feuds and power politics. We know that the policy of isolation, which allowed us to flourish and grow great, is no longer possible. We know that our present well-being will be short lived unless Europe recover and can carry on normal commercial, social, and political relations with us. Rich as our two countries are, indeed, rich as are all the Americas, we in the New World cannot indefinitely subsidize an impoverished, non-self-supporting Europe. That continent must learn again how to take care of itself.

Three choices lie before us:

1. We might withdraw from western Europe, in which case we would in all likelihood abandon Europe to communism. There can no longer be any doubt as to Russia's international program; her army, secret police, and fifth columns have established domination over one small country after the other along her borders and beyond. She is interfering in the domestic affairs of many other countries. While she professes faith in the United Nations, her actions, in and out of that organization, belie that profession. She is abusive, belligerent, uncompromising, and aggressive. While she shouts imperialism at the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially the United States, she is busily engaged in grabbing Sinkiang and northern Korea and threatening Greece and Iran and I may say France and Italy. Her expansion is so great that she threatens to control all independent nations except our own. If the

United Nations is to succeed as a voluntary union of peoples, it is imperative that, pending the realization of its objectives, the existing power relationships among the great nations be preserved. The United States cannot tolerate the expansion of Russia to the point where she can control, directly or indirectly, all the resources and manpower of Europe, Asia, and Africa; for such control would spell the end of a voluntary association of nations and the issue would certainly be decided by war.

A United States of Europe cannot conceivably threaten Russia's security; but, on the contrary, it would mean a substantial contribution to Russian development and well-being. There is nothing aggressive in the uniting of Europe for economic, social, and political purposes. The objectives are the rehabilitation of that unhappy region in the interests of peace and the prevention of war. There is ample reason to believe that the Russian objections to a united Europe are based upon the imperialistic intentions of Russia herself. One of her political techniques is to create disturbances in the world so that she may fish in troubled waters. In short, Russia does not object to a United States of Europe because it would menace her security; she objects to it because it would mark the end of what she thinks is a profitable fishing season.

If Russia were not so bent on establishing a communistic world at any cost, she would readily see that a revived western Europe would mean an increase in trade for eastern Europe. It would mean political and economic stability and therefore greater buying power. It would give Russia a chance to develop her resources and would furnish her with new markets for her goods and raw materials.

However, this course of action does not appeal to Russia and, as long as that is the case, we dare not abandon Europe to her mercies, which we have come to know so well.

Obviously, the easy course of isolationism is not the proper one for the United States, nor for the New World states, to follow with regard to Europe. It would permit Russia to consolidate her power in Europe to such an extent that she would achieve domination over an additional 270,000,000 people. In view of the Kremlin's policies, no one can doubt that such a consolidation of power by Russia in Europe would ultimately spell war for the world, and that the two primary belligerents would be Russia and the United States. Such enormous power and unlimited resources under the control of one autocratic government, when geared to an emotional drive to world revolution, would be accompanied by an irresistible urge to conquer and dominate the world. If it should succeed, it would mean the conquest of mankind by the greatest slave state in all history, a catastrophe beyond the power of description. The nature of the regime in Russia is such that I do not believe it has within it the power to stop of itself. Each success only adds fuel to the fire of its fanaticism. Until it is halted, the urge to greater expansion only becomes stronger each time she scores a triumph.

2. The second course of conduct open to us is the piecemeal approach, which we have been following. This aid, offered on a restricted scale, presents basic difficulties in the formulation and administration of policy; for it seems to have no further aim than the reconstruction of the same old crazy-quilt pattern of European sovereignties, the same redevelopment of highly industrialized communities burning with economic nationalism, and seething with historical wrongs and ambitions. Such a reconstructed Europe would be built upon the same foundation that has produced conflict after conflict and an ever-increasing suspicion, hatred, and distrust among her peoples.

Many scientists and statesmen believe that the traditional national states will have to make way for a broader cooperation among the people of the world. Contemporary international affairs are marked by our going through a great historical transition, which is modifying the old state system into another form of political control. Sound foreign policy dictates the reexamination of the characteristics of the nation state, particularly calling for the elucidation of how states have come into existence and passed into oblivion; what conditions affect the growth of nation states; colonial systems; national economies; the factors which create world crises; the decline of the nation state in terms of international economic dependence; the logistics of heavy industrial concentration; the logic of the drive toward autarchy, and the modern state as a commonwealth or a political economy. Without attempting to evaluate any of these, we cannot fail to recognize that we have entered upon an era when we must explore the possibility of an organized cultural community without terminal associations, an example of which was medieval Europe.

Again without suggesting what the outcome will be in the broader field we cannot escape the conclusion that the piecemeal approach to the settlement of Europe's problems is short-sighted, unstatesmanlike, and blind to the trend of the times.

3. That leaves us with the third and last choice of policy, namely, the promotion, with all our power of persuasion and with all our economic and industrial strength, of an economic and political union of the western European nations. Such a policy would preserve intact and free that Europe which has been the mother of political and religious freedom, the creator of modern industry, the builder of the world's great empires, and the author of some of the greatest literature, science, art, and drama of contemporary life. It need not destroy the cultural autonomy of the individual states which have made these contributions to our civilization.

Our encouragement of a United States of Europe cannot reasonably be construed as the unsolicited meddling of one country in the internal affairs of another. Our interests are personal; they are immediate; they are real. But there is another very urgent reason for our interest. If western Europe were to succumb to the Russians, then the systems, institutions, and forces which have made all North and South America—but especially our two countries—great, will be imperiled. A healthy, prosperous, rehabilitated, and united Europe is one of the best guarantees that our own two countries, and all they stand for, will continue to prosper and flourish.

But we should be remiss in our discussion were we to fail to note that our interests in Europe are also filial. We are simultaneously the trustees and the exponents of European civilization. It is natural law that children shall grow into adults, and, upon reaching maturity, assume their share of responsibilities. So it is with states. We, in the New World, are the children of Europe; and we must assume our share of the burdens which Europe hitherto has carried. As the physical, cultural, and spiritual children of Europe, we inherited at national birth both the blood and the spirit of Europe. While our New World climate has been more invigorating, our resources far richer, and our lands vastly larger than those of Europe—nevertheless our environment is inescapably conditioned by Europe. With limited exceptions, our languages, religions, schools, music, literature, philosophical concepts, social institutions, political phenomena, architectural styles, dress, habits of thought, and ways of living, are fundamentally and inescapably European. Europe has played a leading role in the creation of our commerce, in the opening of our mines, in the building of our railroads, and in the

fashioning of thousands of our enterprises. Europe has performed these services for every country in North and South America. It is no wonder then that we should simultaneously reflect our Old World heredity and our New World environment.

It is not surprising that, as the grown children of Europe, we, in the New World, are now the trustees of a heritage of European civilization and that our future is bound up with that of Europe. Once a European monarch transferred to our shores the seat of his empire; and other European rulers from time to time have fled here for safety. It was here that crucial revolutions occurred through which European doctrines of freedom were tested. New World dynamism has constantly given life to Old World ideas. There is no escaping the link which binds our worlds together. The League of Nations and the United Nations Organization were European in concept; but they came into being chiefly as a result of New World effort and vision. We need not go further to show how completely we, as children of Europe, are interested in what happens to that, at present, unhappy continent, and how inextricably our fate is bound up with hers.

We are more than the mere recipients of a European heritage. Here, and through us, many things which began in Europe have been brought to fruition. With due humility we may observe that in much we are the exponents and maximizers of European civilization. Take, for example, industry and finance. In these fields we are much more than a branch of Europe. Not only have we achieved world leadership; but our strength in these areas, in a very substantial measure, contributed to the United Nations' victory in the Second World War. It was also because of this strength that we in the New World were able to help England survive the ravages of the total war just ended. If we turn to the field of social welfare we note that we have attained the highest standard of living in the world. But we must simultaneously note that the pattern of our social life and institutions is essentially European.

Need we go further in the exploration of the necessity and compulsion of our interest in Europe and in her well-being? That interest may be confused but it is nevertheless there. It is the interest of the adult individual in the security and well-being of his parents, of the pupil in the welfare of the teacher, of the businessman in the prosperity of those with whom he must do business, of the benefactor in the recovery of the person he is assisting, and of one man in the well-being of other men.

We are bound to Europe by the same civilization, and we are set apart from the rest of the world thereby. There are three main bonds which hold us together: (1) The scientific method; (2) the rule of law; and above all (3) the integrity of the individual human being.

#### *The example of the New World*

We, here in the New World, have a real contribution to make and a constructive example to set for Europe to unite and to federate for her own best interest. In no small measure are the successes of Canada and the United States to be attributed to their form of government. Indeed, it is my conviction that the most important single reason why our two countries have succeeded in overshadowing other similar areas of the world in growth and development in many fields is that we have a Federal form of government and thus avoid the countless frictions and internal frustrations of national fragmentation. Had Canada, Quebec, British Columbia, and the Maritime Provinces, and had each of the Thirteen Original Colonies, which rebelled against the British and which later jointly became the United States, insisted upon retaining its independent sovereignty, political and economic dismemberment of

this great continent would have taken place, and it would have been beset by jealousies, suspicions, and distrust so that now North America, like Europe, would have been the scene of political strife and of economic and social frustration.

We often hear it said that the problems of European unification cannot be compared with the problems involved in the federation of our two countries; and I would be among the last to deny that it was considerably easier for us to unite than it will ever be for Europe to do so. But, in spite of this, it should not be overlooked that all of the difficulties, under which Europe now labors, were in some measure to be found here prior to federation. There were boundary problems, currency difficulties, and tariff squabbles and a vast number of other issues which had to be adjusted before unions could be achieved. There were differences of language, religion, and social institutions.

In my own country the issue of slavery could not be solved in the beginning and finally had to be purged by a bloody civil war. Slavery was no small obstacle to unity. Then, too, in the self-sufficient provincial economy of 1776, with its slow means of communication and its limited power of mass destruction, I doubt that the compelling necessity for federation was anything like as obvious to the citizens of that time as it should be to anyone who knows there are supersonic planes and atomic bombs in the arsenals of today.

We solved the problems of that era. With our help, Europe can solve hers, too.

Many years ago we blazed the trail for Europe to follow. If the English of Canada and the French of Quebec, if the Dutchman of New York and the Englishman of Connecticut, if the Frenchman of Louisiana and the Spaniard of California, if the Swede of Delaware and the German of Pennsylvania, could be molded into a single body politic, living amicably with each other, striving for common national purposes, then there is every reason to believe that the Frenchman of France and the Englishman across the Channel, that the Dutchman of Holland and the German of Germany, and even the Spaniard of Spain, with all their neighbors, if given the right conditions, can unite for a reconstructed and rehabilitated Europe.

In other ways, too, we in the New World may be able to furnish Europe with useful examples. Our southern neighbors of Latin America have, over the years, reached among themselves and with us an understanding which is operating in the interest of peace and the settlement of disputes on these two continents. The Pan American Union, looking back to Bolivar for conception and to Blaine for realization, is now much more than an institution for the clarification of information about the countries of the Western Hemisphere. It is a truly international institution on the broadest basis, which, since the beginning of the Second World War, when taken in conjunction with the arrangements entered into between our two countries, has developed into a system of continental security. The Pan American states have accepted responsibility for the administration of the Monroe Doctrine and hemispheric defense. The Act of Chapultepec, supplemented by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, has created an American system of hemispheric defense.

In trade, in transportation, and in many other ways the countries of the New World have blazed the trail for Europe, showing her how to reach effective and creative federation. In addition to these examples and the several more general inducements mentioned above, there are two particular reasons why states are driven into federation. One is the danger from foreign powers; the other is the inconvenience and inefficiency of economic separation. These reasons impelled both of our governments to adopt a unified

federal form of political organization. Both reasons are impelling forces of utmost urgency in Europe today.

#### *Why Europe must and can unite*

We have now seen why it is of the utmost importance to us that Europe unite. Let us next see why it is of the greatest importance to Europe herself that she unite.

It was C. B. Fawcett, one of the world's leading geographers, who said in 1941, when discussing the bases of a world commonwealth:

"There are but two unchangeable natural units of human organization—the individual and the whole of mankind. All intermediate units, such as the family, clan, tribe, or nation, church or state, or other association, are changeable or changing."

I agree with this observation, but, at the same time, it would be unrealistic for us to disregard the power of racial, historical, cultural, and other prejudices which have divided Europe into seemingly permanent units called states. In spite of the forces making for separation, there are many compelling factors which are working for the eventual termination of European differences, and for the wiping out of racial trade, and other barriers that for centuries have afflicted European politics.

It is not necessary to canvass them all here, but a few might be mentioned. The political frontiers of Europe are largely historical and seldom follow geographical lines. Racial groups, as a rule, cannot be separated from each other by any clear-cut line, but, rather, one group merges into the other through a zone of intermarriage and mixed population. No boundary line can do justice to all. The railroads of Europe, in response to economic requirements, cut across the Continent with complete disregard for geographical and political boundaries. The inland waterways, both natural and artificial, make Europe a single economic whole; and it is not by chance that effort after effort has been made to internationalize the major rivers such as the Danube, the Rhine, and the Elbe. Europe's industry and her skilled populations are located where iron, coal, and other mineral deposits have made it possible for the industrial life to develop. Europe's food supply is derived from a number of countries, regardless of political frontiers. The bread basket of Europe lies in the east. That basket comprises in whole, or in part, at least nine states distinguished for the liveliness of their politics. Together they are deeply affected by a constant common need—the need for food and the need for economic unification. It is the need for the agricultural areas to support the industrial. It is the need for the latter to supply the former with tools and necessities. It is the need for bringing to the industrial areas the benefit of tremendous water-power resources in other countries.

There are signs that Europe realizes the need for union. At the moment plans are being drawn for a customs union of Western Europe. In making these plans European statesmen must be mindful that the foundation of the modern German Reich, which a short while ago was the most powerful continental state, was the merging of common economic interests into customs unions. Out of these unions came the political integration which unified the German states into a single empire. Europe should be able to reach unification by the same road.

One of the chief reasons why Europe needs to unite is that the Continent, in its present fragmentary form, is a large power vacuum which Russia is striving to fill. The people of Europe could easily lose faith in our ability to protect them from Communist infiltration and subjugation. Some have come to believe that Russian domination is inevitable. The success of the recent coups in Hungary and Bulgaria will speed the process.



All the millions of dollars sent in aid to Greece and Turkey, and to be sent to Italy and France, will be unsuccessful unless some positive program of action on Europe's part gives evidence that she means to help herself and does not intend to succumb to the spirit of defeatism which has been too evident in her life.

A United States of Europe is the answer to the dilemma. We must encourage its formulation. Russia, of course, will oppose it bitterly. Even though such a federation would not threaten Russia, it would interfere with the spread of communism and it is to be expected Russian opposition will be exerted in many ways, especially through Moscow's influence over the Communist party in France. This opposition is certainly one of the important obstacles to the achievement of a European federation. But that does not mean that we should give up hope, for, even in France, the Communists control less than one-third of the votes and, therefore, with strong leadership in the democratic parties, France could take the lead in promoting a European union. Although France is torn by internal dissension, she is not through as a great nation and she will again develop statesmen of the caliber of Briand and Jaures, who worked so hard for European federation. It is this France, united with England, which must take the lead in uniting Europe in spite of Russia's opposition.

Let us be under no illusions. If Russia obtains control of western Europe, the control of Africa, the Near East, and the Middle East will fall into her lap like a ripe plum. She will thus be able to carry into full effect the geopolitical objectives of Haushofer and Rudolf Hess. The only difference will be that Russia—not Germany—will become the master of Europe. Russia will then control not only the heartland but the whole world island, and Europe, Asia, and Africa will become the arsenal of the Slavs. That, in rather naked terms, is the fundamental power issue which lies behind the federation of Europe. It is no longer a question of Europe's ruling, or not ruling, dependencies and tropical and backward countries. The question now is, Will Europe in her turn be ruled? The answer lies with Europe. But Europe cannot give it alone; she needs our moral and tangible help if she is to answer it with imagination, courage, and determination.

#### THE NEW WORLD LOOKS AT THE OLD WORLD

##### II

In the first lecture last evening, I discussed in some detail some of the reasons why Europe must unite for her own salvation as well as for ours. I alluded to certain other aspects of the question which I should like to develop further tonight. It may be that some of these arguments will seem repetitious to you, but I think the subject is of such vital importance to the future of our countries that some repetition will not be amiss.

Last spring, on March 21, when I introduced a resolution in the Senate of the United States endorsing the idea of a United States of Europe, there was a great deal of editorial comment throughout the country. Most of the comment was favorable and a few editors were enthusiastic but, generally, they seemed to think the idea was too good to be practicable. In other words, while they recognized the need and the good sense of the proposal, they were defeatists regarding its achievement. It was obvious from many of the articles that the writers had never seriously considered the proposal before and were unaware of its ancient and respectable lineage. I think, therefore, that some further reference to its ancestry and to the considerations favorable and unfavorable to its adoption may be appropriate.

#### History of European federation

Since the beginning of the Middle Ages, two contradictory forces have been pulling Europe in opposite directions. One has been a strong tendency toward local particularism, which has produced small feudal entities and new national states. The other has been the slow-growing desire for the unification of European peoples on a continental basis.

The pages of western history are filled with philosophical discussions of how Europe should be organized in order to achieve unity and to eliminate recurrent warfare. These need no repetition here, but I am sure that in this connection a number of illustrious names will come to your minds: The medieval Pierre Dubois, the fourteenth century Dante, King Podebrad of Bohemia, Erasmus, Dean John Colet, Sebastian Franck, Sir Thomas More, William Pestel, Comines, Emeric Cruce, Hugo Grotius, William Penn, Abbé Saint-Pierre, and Immanuel Kant, to mention only a few of the more outstanding. I would like to impress upon you that these men were not idealistic dreamers. They were thoughtful and practical men.

Statesmen, too, have tried their hand at unification. One immediately recalls the grand design of Henry IV, Elizabeth, and the Duke of Sully in this connection. Occasionally statesmen resorted to force to compel Europe to combine as did Charlemagne, Louis XIV, and Napoleon.

However, it was not until after the First World War that the movement for a European federation became widespread. Since then not only has the subject been discussed extensively but many books dealing with it and a new journal called Pan-Europa have appeared. France took the lead in exploring the practical aspects of the idea, and in 1925 Premier Herriot seriously considered having his country assume responsibility for the establishment of a European federation. In 1926 a federation conference was called in Vienna, in 1930 a second was convoked in Berlin, and in 1932 a third met in Basle. During 1929 and 1930 Foreign Minister Briand, of France, became the leader of the unified continental forces working for federation and unification. In calling together the 1926 Congress the following statement was issued:

"Anarchy is indeed the only appropriate description for a society of 34 states without law, without organization, without common organs or authorities, without a court of justice, without a police force, and without a solidarity; a society the members of which are in perpetual strife with one another and pile up murderous weapons against one another; a society in which might takes precedence over right, and in which the normal methods of negotiations are threats and blackmail; a society in which the members are ruled by club law, as were states and castles in the darkest days of the Middle Ages."

Although the efforts of the twenties did not result in the creation of a unified and federated Continent, the acceptability of the idea to many Europeans was made clear in the numerous efforts at economic unification. Even Hitler made it the heart of his economic propaganda program; and it is fair to say that many Europeans, who later laid down their lives in war against Hitler, were in full agreement with him on the idea of a European federation.

Actually, as I have said before, Europe has had many experiences with federation in the past—the Holy Roman Empire, the Confederation of the Rhine, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, and Germany. Federation is therefore a tried and tested arrangement, not only on this continent but Europe also has used it on a limited basis and with success.

#### Requirements for federation

Federation has been given so much thought, in the past, that patterns of or-

ganization have been thought out and are ready for adoption. Obviously, Europe does not need a universal empire nor a constitution like that of the United States. Nor does she require a Canadian system. She must have her own brand of union which gives effect to national peculiarities and aspirations. It must be something more than the utopian concepts of the nineteenth-century Lorimer and his predecessors, who reechoed Saint Pierre and lacked the realism of Sully and Henry IV.

One of the organizations advocated for Europe recommends the establishment of an upper house, a house of representatives, and the assignment to the federated government of matters concerned with foreign policy, justice, and security of the federation.

Duncan and Elizabeth Wilson, in their thought-provoking *Federation and World Order*, published in 1940, suggested an international federal government, with a house of representatives, an upper house or senate, an international civil service, an international army, an international judiciary, all based upon a fundamental constitution or charter.

William Ivor Jennings, in 1940, devoted several pages of his excellent work, *A Federation for Western Europe*, to a draft constitution for such a federation. In that constitution he covered membership in the federation, the constitution as supreme law, the guaranty of territorial integrity to the federated states, citizenship in the states and in the federation, the president, the council of ministers, the federal legislature consisting of a peoples' house and a states' house, and the control of the federation over external relations, defense, dependencies, and a number of other items.

Thus the patterns of federalism have been extensively explored. Even the United Nations Organization provides in its Charter the basis for a European federation under the heading of "regional organizations."

I do not wish to leave the impression at any point in this discussion that I am unaware of, or minimize, the seriousness of the obstacles to federation. There are powerful influences obstructing the path to unity, but I do not think they are insuperable. Let us summarize the obstacles which appear to be the most potent.

#### The obstacles in the way

1. The basic difficulty which must be overcome is the intensity of national feeling, attended by prejudices, fears, and animosities deeply ingrained in Europe's people by patriotism and past history. National feelings are so powerful that they keep Europe divided, even though geographically it is less broken by barriers than China. We can ascribe lack of political and economic unity to human obstacles alone. In spite of the fact that Europe is a single permanent regional division of the habitable world, and in spite of the fact that not one of her political divisions can make a claim to a similar status, nevertheless every national group in Europe regards itself as a permanent entity. Nationalistic hatreds have kept European peoples apart for centuries, and as long as the present nation-states remain unmodified they will continue to do so.

2. A second obstacle in the way of union is the seeming danger that a union of Europe will be an occasion for the domination of the whole Continent by the German people. Other nationalities cannot help noting that, since the middle of the nineteenth century, the Germans have become the most numerous people on the Continent. They substantially outnumber the French or the Italians or the English. It should be pointed out, however, that in spite of their being the most numerous people they still constitute less than one-third of the population of the contemplated federation of western Europe. Working together, there is no reason why the

other peoples in the federation could not avoid domination by the Germans.

3. A third obstacle consists of Soviet Russia's efforts to unite the Continent in her own interests by power methods similar to those used by Louis XIV, Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler. Russia is bending every effort short of war to achieve unification of the states under her domination. She is turning the full force of her economy and propaganda toward preventing the federation or unification of Europe by any other means than her own.

4. A fourth and important obstacle is the language problem. It makes difficult the ordinary intercourse of the citizens and hampers the free movement of persons and the flow of ideas and information so important to the achievement of understanding and unity. But you in Canada have overcome that difficulty, and so have the Swiss.

5. A fifth obstacle is incompatible political ideologies, which are still active and which cannot be considered as conducive to cooperative or unified actions between or among states. Authoritarian states still exist in western Europe. Both communism and fascism have holds upon large sections of the populations.

6. A sixth obstacle is cultural differences, which oftentimes are much stronger than blood differences.

7. A seventh obstacle is religious differences, which are especially pronounced in eastern Europe.

8. But overshadowing all other obstacles in European history, from the nationalistic standpoint, is a ledger of unrequited injuries from the past, which each state keeps to be settled at some future date.

These by no means exhaust the list of obstacles, but they will serve to show how great is the task of federating Europe. C. B. Fawcett said six years ago:

"It is to this anarchic Europe, of conflicting sovereign independent states and incompatible political ideologies, of uneasy majorities and rebellious minorities, of peace-loving peoples and aggressive tyrants, that any proposals for a United States of Europe are to be applied."

It is entirely possible that the obstacles may be overemphasized.

In 1878, looking upon a scene no less difficult, the great Swiss scholar, J. K. Bluntschli, as he advocated the union of Europe, said:

"The need for a solution of the problem (of a European confederation) is today present and imperative and will grow more so from year to year. I do not know when another serious effort at solving the problem will be undertaken but I am firmly convinced that one or more European statesmen, in the not too distant future, will undertake the task and bring it to completion. The work is much easier than has been the establishment of the German Reich. The great danger which always prevented union, namely, the hegemony of one state over another, has now finally been overcome."

When those optimistic thoughts were expressed, Europe was a prosperous paradise compared to what she is today. The necessity for drastic reform was far less obvious or compelling then than it is today. The present and the future of Europe, in the absence of some really significant reform, is scarcely bright. Winston Churchill with his usual talent for forceful descriptions put it very well when he said:

"But what is Europe now? It is a rubble-heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations."

#### *The new situation in Europe—Russian opposition*

All through the Second World War the federation idea persisted in some form, and as the conflict drew to an end and the United

Nations Charter was being formulated it was deemed expedient to incorporate into the Charter article 52, the provision which encouraged "regional arrangements for peace and security consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations." While this presumably was meant to cover the Monroe Doctrine, it had special significance for Europe.

It is not clear now if any European participant in the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conferences had a united states of Europe in mind as the subject of article 52. Certainly Soviet Russia did not, for she was opposed to all efforts at European unification. Ever since 1917 Soviet Russia has distrusted and opposed all plans for the unification of Europe. Lenin condemned federation as a threat to Russian security and his successors have followed his line meticulously.

And so it is today. Russia still opposes all plans for European recovery including customs unions. She has warned the Scandinavian states against cooperation and confederation, presumably because cooperative action among European states will make more difficult Russian plans for the domination of the Continent.

The Russian fear must be understood in terms of what appear to be Soviet interests and purposes. Political fragmentation and war have reduced European states to near impotence in the face of the power of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This suits Russia perfectly, for it gives her great freedom of action on the Continent. She fears, however, that Europe will discover that it has at hand the means for achieving power comparable with that of Russia if Europe will only take advantage of the opportunity to unite. Soviet statesmen naturally fear the revival of German military strength. They know that now the German people are slowly starving, the country is stripped of industrial resources, the agricultural land is depleted, and the military system is dead. But they fear the unified revival of the Continent because they believe that it will provide German industry and agriculture with an opportunity once again to create another powerful military force with which to challenge Soviet preponderance in the future. Naturally, therefore, there is continued Russian skepticism about and opposition to a United States of Europe.

But it is my conviction that it is precisely in a United States of Europe that the security of Russia and the world must be sought. Federation is a most powerful guaranty against a resurgent German military power. Indeed, I can see no other way in which to solve the German problem. Today, because of the fear of Germany, we have been forced to impose levels of production on her economy which are disastrous not only to that country but to all of western Europe. We know that the holding of German production down to a fraction of its prewar level has caused starvation in Germany and costs to England and ourselves of enormous sums of badly needed resources. The curtailment in the production of coal and steel essential to construction and the resulting idleness and destitution have set the stage for communism. We are not blind to the fact that the unleashing of German energy and industrial skill and productive power will produce better conditions on the continent of Europe, but we must be assured that it will not simultaneously renew war and militarism. Again I say that this assurance can be found in a United States of Europe.

Federation is the solution of both the European problem and of the German problem. "If," as Churchill says, "without prejudice to any future question of German federation . . . individual (German) states . . . (are) . . . invited to take their place in the council of Europe," that is, if they operate as individual states in a Eu-

ropean federation, then France and England participating in such a confederation can guarantee peace and security to the Continent, for they will more than offset the German states acting singly or in combination. Moreover, the economic pattern will be such that no single element or state or combination of states in the federation can conceivably break away and carry on a successful war against the others.

The conclusion is that the best solution for the dilemma of lagging European production is the merging of European states into a larger union, a union so large that there will be no danger of German domination or aggression. If this is done, the productive power of Germany will be the spark to light the furnaces of industry and to speed the movement of trade throughout western Europe. Europe can once again become self-supporting and resume her proper role in the society of nations. No country with peaceful intentions can, with reason and logic, object to such a development. Opposition can only come from aggressive power-political interests whose purpose is the domination of European states individually and collectively.

#### *Europe as an idea implies confederation*

Having viewed some of the obstacles in the way of a successful federation of Europe, let us look again at some of the reasons why a federation will ultimately come about and why it is neither chimerical nor an idle dream.

In order to succeed, federations require something more than lands and people living in close proximity. There must be a force holding the member states together which impels them to union.

Perhaps the most important single force both in the United States and in Canada which operated in favor of federation was the feeling in all of the colonies that they belonged together and that they individually constituted segments of a single whole. Even today that feeling is hard to define, but we know it was there at the time of union. For about 150 years, the Thirteen Colonies, which later became the United States, were associated in common perils, objectives, and struggles. Later they were united in a revolutionary war, whose purpose was political freedom. Economic, social, and political forces finally compelled them to unite. So it was with your people. Even British Columbia, which for a time seemed lost, eventually had to decide that its proper course lay in union with Canada, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces rather than in annexation to the United States. Thus, in both our countries an undefinable bond, which can only be described as a common consciousness of belonging to the same group, knitted our people into a single whole.

I believe that I can discern a similar force operating in Europe today. It has operated unnoticed for a long time. Again I quote from Bluntschli:

"In spite of all the language and national differences, which separate European people, and in spite of the many struggles in which they are engaged against each other, they are permeated by a feeling of being the same sort and possessing common interests as a European people; and they are bound together in spite of all these things into an ancient European brotherhood of states."

More recently, Winston Churchill said of Europe:

"It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontiers, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization."

"In the rich pattern of culture," says Mr. Sewell, "there are many strands; the Hebrew belief in God, the Christian message of compassion and redemption, the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness, the



Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

"These are not my words, but they are my faith."

Thus Europe is an idea, a concept, a belief, a feeling which has been held by the people of that Continent for generations, which has enabled them to shape and dominate history for the last few hundred years, and which has permitted their sons and daughters to carry Europe's message and institutions, its religion, art, law, science, and industry to all parts of the world.

In the light of this common feeling, it is not strange that the idea of a continental federation should have attracted Europeans for hundreds of years. Occasionally some form of unification has been achieved. The Roman Empire united western Europe by force, and in the ninth century, Charlemagne welded the Continent into a great empire stretching from Spain to the Elbe River. Later, the Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic Church knit European society into a loose yet effectual whole, held together by social and spiritual bonds.

Even the national particularism, which appeared with the dawn of modern states in the fifteenth century, was unable to destroy the European concept here described. It is true that the rise of the national state and its armies, as well as the appearance of the nation in arms, which reached its extreme form in modern totalitarianism, produced the political fragmentation of Europe for over 500 years. But in spite of this, the European people have retained their common consciousness. They know that from prehistoric times they have belonged to the same white race whose branches are to be found in north Africa and south Asia. They still believe that they once possessed a common primitive civilization going back to neolithic times, and they are aware of the significance of the statement of philologists that with one exception all their languages have been derived from a common mother tongue. Their political organizations and customs have developed along similar lines and their histories have been distinguishable from the unchanging lethargy which has characterized oriental despotism. All this is reflected in European thoughts and attitudes.

Within the last 6 months two incidents have occurred which indicate that both my country and Europe have sensed the necessity for joint and cooperative action in Europe if the rehabilitation of that region is to be achieved. The first of these incidents was Secretary of State Marshall's speech at Harvard in June.

Implicit in his statement that "any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative," is the idea that more than mere relief of the present distress, and revival of the same old order, must be accomplished. His emphasis upon cooperative or joint planning and action by the European nations, indicates to me that he recognized that, in order to achieve a cure, their problems must be viewed as a whole and solved as a whole. It seems only common sense that to try to rehabilitate each nation individually, without regard to the whole, would be excessively wasteful, extravagant and ineffective in the long run. If it requires joint action to rehabilitate Europe, it is equally important that they continue to act together if they are to remain strong enough to preserve their freedom and independence from foreign domination.

In response to Secretary Marshall's suggestion, representatives of 16 of the western European nations gathered in Paris last summer and, with an extraordinary spirit of good will and cooperation, unanimously issued a report in September. That report gives us the most recent indication of the trend of

thinking of European statesmen, and gives us good reason to believe that they do not regard economic and political federation as impracticable or unrealistic as some of our people have supposed. In that report the cooperating states pledged themselves in part as follows:

"(v) To cooperate with one another and with like-minded countries in all possible steps to reduce the tariffs and other barriers to the expansion of trade both between themselves and with the rest of the world, in accordance with the principles of the draft charter for an international trade organization.

"(vi) To remove progressively the obstacles to the free movement of persons within Europe;

"(vii) To organize together the means by which common resources can be developed in partnership."

Elsewhere the signatory powers (p. 39) pledged that—

"When production sufficiently increases, countries at present maintaining export restrictions will abolish them. As regards import restrictions, an essential condition for the freer development of European trade, on a multilateral basis, is that balance of payments difficulties should be progressively reduced. These difficulties will diminish as production increases, internal stability is re-established, and export trade expands. As they diminish, the participating countries will reduce progressively restrictions on their mutual trade. This would be facilitated by the adoption of a system of transferability, designed to make European currencies interchangeable, as proposed by the committee of financial experts in chapter II of their report, on which a meeting of experts is to be held in London on September 22."

This bible of European recovery recognizes that the problem does not end with recovery; but that much more is implied in the so-called Marshall plan. While it does not develop the theme in so many words, the report does give time and space to two recent and notable instances of European cooperation: (1) The customs convention signed in London on September 5, 1944, to which Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands were parties, and (2) Scandinavian cooperation discussed at Copenhagen on August 27 and 28, 1947.

The report further develops the idea of the need for closer economic cooperation than in the past, observing—

"That the present division of Europe into small economic units does not correspond to the needs of modern competition and that it will be possible with the help of customs unions to construct larger units on the strictly economic plane."

Of exceptional significance is that part which deals with the development of hydroelectric resources. It reads in part as follows:

"This work involves the cooperative development of resources cutting across frontiers and the decisions are being taken without regard to national frontiers. Preparation of periodic revisions of a survey of European large-scale power resources and the study of the desirability of establishing an international high-tension network represent similar fields for continuing common planning."

Much the same philosophy and attitude may be discerned in the passages dealing with steel production. Here is an example (p. 39):

"In view of the high cost of installation of steel-producing capacity, arrangements are being made for the interchange of information by the steel-producing countries about their programmes of modernization and extension so that each country, in developing its programme, may take account of the plans made by the others."

These pledges, I submit, are unique in European history and if properly nurtured

and directed in the administration of the Marshall plan could result in the unification of the signatory powers.

Another cause for hope occurred on September 12, 1947, when it was announced that 14 states, namely, Austria, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, Ireland, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, and Rumania (10 additional eastern European countries, including Russia, were probably to be invited), were arranging meetings for a discussion of closer cooperation and the possibilities of a customs union embracing them all.

The cynics may scoff at these pledges and these conferences. They can point to broken pledges and many failures in the past, but failures are an important part of the whole of human experience. In a negative way they are the guideposts to success rather than proof that success is unattainable.

Human institutions develop slowly and painfully. Rarely are they completed at one time and set into successful motion immediately upon their conception. It took 150 years of colonial experiences, and centuries of English background, to create the Constitution of the United States of America. That instrument was anticipated by many conferences and efforts at union before it was ever consummated. Therefore we recognize that Europe, complicated in structure, diverse in population, and confused in economic activity, cannot create at one stroke an international order of peace and security. The important thing is that many thoughtful men of both the Old and the New World have recognized the objective toward which we should move if western civilization is to avoid self-destruction or domination by the East.

It was not pure accident that the World Wars of 1914 and 1939 originated in Europe. Such conflicts are the logical result of the inconsistencies, the clashing of national interests which inhere in the confinement of modern industrialism within the restrictions of a medieval political system. An effective universal system such as the United Nations could adjust these conflicts, but, until that organization develops, the adjustment must be made on a more limited scale if self-destruction is to be avoided.

Federation is also the answer to the threat of Russian domination. William Henry Chamberlin, in his book, *The Cockpit of Europe*, shows with convincing clarity how communism has spread over eastern Europe. Ruthless minorities in different countries, by a combination of sabotage, terror, and force, have seized power in one country after another and established police states. It would be unlikely that such tactics could be used successfully against a United States of Europe.

There are many other reasons why we have cause for hope that federation will come about. The last one to which I shall call your attention is the compelling character of economic forces working for union. Prior to the Second World War, Europe, over the centuries, had developed a highly integrated economy which possessed a unique balance of agriculture, industry, and trade. That balance was shattered by 6 years of campaigns. The present difficulties of Europe are merely manifestations of the impossibility of maintaining national particularism in the face of continental economic forces which, in order to operate, must disregard national frontiers. The industrial Ruhr, the coal-mining Saar, and the industrial Silesia, are not German, French, and Polish alone. They belong to all of Europe and are the heritage upon which the whole Continent should build.

The Europe of the future, if it is to rise from its ashes, must find some way by which the steel and coal of Germany, the shipping of England, the surplus labor supply of Italy, and the many other contributions of the individual countries can be pooled for

the common continental good. A United States of Europe, I am convinced, is the answer, and I believe that is borne out by the report of the Committee on European Economic Cooperation. Here are three additional significant passages.

On page 2:

"(viii) The participating countries \* \* \* further stated their belief that the establishment of a joint organization to review the progress made in carrying out the recovery program will be necessary. On page 12 the signatory states announce that the production program provides for mutual help between the participating countries over a wide field, and for a number of practical steps for specific action, such as the international power project. In addition broader proposals are made for the reduction of trade barriers and the removal of financial obstacles to intra-European trade."

But the most significant passage of all is the one which deals with the obliteration of national boundaries as they may stand in the way of satisfactory arrangements for the hydroelectric plants of Italy and France. The report says that the committee "examined many projects and chose a plan which comprises six hydroelectric plants in Italy, France, and on the Austro-Italo-Swiss frontier together with two lignite thermal plants in Germany and one geothermal plant in Italy. These projects have been selected without regard to national frontiers and involved in some cases the cooperative development of resources cutting across frontiers."

But, why labor the point further? These and a whole series of measures providing for closer cooperation and the ultimate elimination of difficulties affecting trade, industry, and the free flow of goods and people across national frontiers are but the beginning of closer European cooperation, which should end in only one way—a United States of Europe.

#### *Where do Britain and Canada stand?*

By now several of you must be asking yourselves, where does Britain fit into the picture? If Britain were to join a federated Europe, what would happen to her relations with members of the British Commonwealth of Nations? What would Ireland's role be in such a new arrangement? Would she remain aloof while Britain entered, or would she join side by side with Britain? Specifically, what would be the effect upon Canadian-British relations? Would there be any change in Canada's relations with Europe and with the other dominions?

The answers to these questions would tax the powers of a seer, and I make no claims in that direction. I have assumed throughout that a European union without Britain would lack realism, and for that reason British membership would be a *sine qua non* of federation. It seems to me that there are no insurmountable obstacles in the way of Britain fulfilling her obligations in both federations with injury neither to herself nor to any other state. Indeed, there is reason to believe that by her possession of membership in both, Britain would play a larger role in the quest for world peace.

Ireland would have to decide for herself whether she would join or not, but the advantages of union would be so pronounced that she would probably join at the outset. If, for any reason, she deemed it best not to join a European union immediately, it could only be a question of time before she ultimately would join. The Irish economy is bound to that of the rest of the British Isles and to that of the Continent. The isolation resulting from aloofness would cause disadvantages in trade and discriminations, which Ireland would find too onerous to bear.

As for Britain's relations with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the bonds which tie the group together are so flexible that there should be no difficulty in finding an adjustment which

would allow Britain to be a member of both. It will be recalled that the reciprocity arrangements of 1911 between our two countries presented no serious constitutional obstacles for Canada. Empire preference could be made consistent with obligations in a new European union. In short, to an outsider there seems to be no insurmountable reason why Britain could not accept membership in a European union consistent with her position in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

If this view is correct, a Europe, into which Britain was federated, could offer only advantages to Canada, the other dominions, and to the world at large. Britain would be a tie between two of the most economically significant groups in the world. Her dual membership would give her the opportunity to bring the two closer together. Politically and militarily the dual membership could eventually become a great force for peace and stability.

In closing, permit me to emphasize a few points. In recent weeks the Russians have directed a vicious and clever attack upon the motives of the United States in granting assistance to Europe. I am fully aware of the delicacy of the situation. Gestures of good will on the part of the strong, or measures of enlightened self-interest are easily misrepresented and misconstrued. The fact is that our fundamental interest in the creation of a strong, prosperous, and free European community is that such a Europe can make a powerful contribution to the keeping of the peace. Britain and the Commonwealth were the great stabilizing influence in the last century. The New World must now assume much of that burden, but we need the help of a strong Europe. The small and, relatively speaking, impotent nations of Europe, unless they are welded into a federation, can contribute little to the keeping of the peace. If they do not, separately, become mere pawns in the game of power politics, at best they will become ineffective neutrals which, to that extent, will weaken western civilization in its resistance to the unlimited expansions of Russia. A strong, independent Europe would not encourage us to seek the domination of the world, and at the same time it would discourage such an undertaking by any other great power.

The criticism has been made that advocating a federation of Europe is officious intermeddling by Americans. At the same time, however, we are told that we have a responsibility to use our power and our wealth to rehabilitate the stricken areas of the world. These views are inconsistent. If we grant that we have this obligation, then we must also be obliged to see that the rehabilitation is sensible and effective. There can be no obligation to recreate the same old divided Europe, from which two world wars have emerged to afflict us. Surely we have a legitimate interest in the purposes for which the products of our land and the work of our people are to be expended.

We have sympathy for the Europeans in their distress. We have, I believe, consideration for their pride and self-respect, but as partners in undertaking to preserve in the world an opportunity for men to be free, we are entitled, if not obliged, to use our best judgment and all our powers of persuasion.

It is not proposed that we force our ideas upon any country, but I do propose that, insofar as we are able, we persuade the Europeans to follow the path to political unity. Many of the wisest Europeans of the past and of the present have advocated it, so it is not an alien idea. There are many obstacles, but with the example and the generous assistance of the New World, I am sure that Europe can surmount all of them.

Finally, may I say that in this confused and troubled world, stricken by two utterly senseless and stupid fratricidal wars within a quarter century, there is one hard fact

that stands out clear and reassuring and that is the friendship and good will that exists between your country and my country and, in truth, among all the peoples of the New World. This example of self-restraint and good sense has been, and will continue to be, not only our own salvation, but gives us the right, I believe, to look to the Old World and offer it our advice and our help to go and do likewise.

#### THE MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a very able and penetrating article which appeared yesterday, written by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Evil for Good Ends," dealing with the whole question of the argument of fear as a premise upon which to base support for the Marshall plan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. In connection with this article, I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think Mr. Lippmann performs a great service for the thinking of the American people by pointing out that all history records that no nation can live by the sword, and that no nation can hope, of course, to survive on the doctrine of fear. It is well to point out that, as we come to analyze and debate the Marshall plan, we ought to consider it solely and entirely from the standpoint of the economic merits of the plan, the contribution of the plan to winning the peace, and the soundness of the plan in carrying out the idealism of our belief in the brotherhood of man which has always characterized the American democracy.

I would particularly emphasize the next to the last paragraph in Mr. Lippmann's article. It seems to me it ought to sink through the cortexes and deep into the brains of the thinking people of America, because I think he is unanswerably sound in the premises he lays down in that paragraph when he says:

Fear is a bad motive in diplomacy and fright is a poor substitute for argument in dealing with a democratic people like our own. The genuine motive of the Marshall plan is an interest in the revival of great nations and in the unity of Europe and in the peace of the world. In arguing the case for the Marshall plan, it is a mistake to rely upon fright. This plan calls for a sustained effort over a period of more than four years, and if it has no better foundation in American life than fear, the effort will not be sustained. It is not possible to maintain a state of hysteria and fear over a period of 4 years.

Mr. President, as one in the Senate who sincerely believes that without the Marshall plan the hope of winning the peace becomes most remote, I am going to argue consistently and constantly in the Senate and throughout the Nation for the adoption of the plan on the basis of its economic soundness, and on the basis of its carrying out the idealism of America, for if we ever lose the idealism, then we become a lost Nation. Also I shall support the plan on the ground that from the standpoint of national self-interest it is essential to winning the peace.



EXHIBIT A  
EVIL FOR GOOD ENDS  
(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a notion, held by some in Washington, that the only way to win the support of Congress for the Marshall plan is to frighten it. I believe that nothing but mischief can come of that, and that to organize a propaganda of fear would be wrong in itself, would not deserve to work, and would not in fact work.

A campaign of fear designed to ride roughshod over all doubts and hesitations would be at bottom an attempt to rob the Congress of its right to be convinced and its duty to deliberate. The notion, though it is put forward by fervent, even frantic, opponents of the totalitarian system, is profoundly undemocratic. It lacks a decent respect for the dignity of representative government, and it rests on the self-righteous assumption that the true believers in whatever it is that is to be stamped through Congress are entitled to do evil that good may prevail.

The practitioners of this notion have been operating for nearly a year, ever since the crisis of last March during which the Truman doctrine was improvised. That crisis, which arose out of a diplomatic failure to anticipate and to prepare for the recession of the British power in the Eastern Hemisphere, caused a panic within the administration. The panic caused it to stampede Congress into voting aid to Greece. The campaign of fear employed to stampede Congress, though it may have been successful in lining up the votes, committed the United States so publicly and so irretrievably that it was then impossible to make a success of the Greek policy.

In order to frighten Congress, the administration put itself in a position where in fact it was married indissolubly to any Greek government in Athens which, no matter what else it did or did not do, proclaimed its anticommunism. The propaganda employed to sell the Truman doctrine for Greece deprived the United States of its leverage and influence in Greece.

An intervention may have been necessary. It might, if we had remained free agents, have been successful. But because of the way it was sold to Congress, it has become an entanglement in which American prestige is at stake on the outcome of a civil war in which the Government we are supporting can and does compel us to support it on its terms, not on ours.

Something of the same sort is happening in Germany. The net practical effect of telling the world that we are going to stop communism by subsidizing anti-Communists is that we are losing control over western Germany. Whereas we can still spend 6 months debating whether we shall give aid to our great allies, the British and the French, in western Germany we no longer have any such freedom of decision.

For we have committed ourselves to, and have staked our prestige so completely on making Bizonia a going concern, that we must now subsidize the Germans no matter what they do or fail to do. We cannot bargain with the Germans as we propose to bargain with the British and the French, saying that we shall furnish assistance provided they in their turn carry out the engagements they have made.

In Germany we have to furnish the assistance, and we cannot withhold it if the Germans do not fulfill their part of the bargain. There is no bargain in Germany because we have made ourselves so wholly responsible for the condition of life among our Germans. We have therefore deprived ourselves of the power to say to the Germans that we shall stop the subsidy if Bavaria and Lower Saxony choose to put their food into the black market rather than into the Ruhr.

Fear is a bad motive in diplomacy and fright is a poor substitute for argument in dealing with a democratic people like our own. The genuine motive of the Marshall plan is an interest in the revival of great nations and in the unity of Europe and in the peace of the world. In arguing the case for the Marshall plan, it is a mistake to rely upon fright. This plan calls for a sustained effort over a period of more than 4 years, and if it has no better foundation in American life than fear, the effort will not be sustained. It is not possible to maintain a state of hysteria and fear over a period of 4 years.

Either our people will decide that they are being bamboozled by the cry of wolf—wolf, or they will decide that they prefer the horrors of war itself to living a life of unending anxiety. In either event they will not give the Marshall plan the kind of support which it must have if it is to be successful.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD—PROPOSED  
APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL KUTER TO  
BE CHAIRMAN.

MR. MORSE. I wish to speak on another matter, Mr. President, quite unrelated to the remarks just made. I have been—and I think the word properly to be used in this instance is the word "deluged"—I have been deluged in recent hours with communications from various parts of the country, including my home State, in protest form, in criticism form, and in inquiry form as to whether or not the position I took in opposition to the appointment of General Kuter as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board meant that I was serving notice by implication that I am opposed to the boom for General Eisenhower for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. I am at a complete loss, Mr. President, to figure out why anyone could make the interpretation that I am necessarily opposed to the Eisenhower boom because of the position I took on the Kuter matter. But being a neophyte in American politics, Mr. President, I daily marvel at the mysteries and the wonders of political strategy.

If anyone thinks he or she is putting me on the spot by the inquiries I am receiving about my position on Eisenhower, he has another thought coming, because one is never on the spot, Mr. President, when his position is as crystal clear as my position is on either the Eisenhower or Kuter issues. My opposition to the Kuter appointment does not subject itself in the slightest degree whatsoever to any interpretation that the junior Senator from Oregon will necessarily oppose for the Republican nomination any military official who has become a civilian at the time the matter of his possible nomination is under advisement by the convention.

I suppose I ought to be flattered or highly complimented over the fact that any interest is shown by any substantial number of people as to my position in regard to who should be the Republican nominee. I suppose it is because many progressives and independent voters seem to share my views on political issues. I want to say to these inquirers who are after me to clarify my position on Eisenhower that I have taken no position on General Eisenhower, and I do not intend, Mr. President, to take any position on General Eisenhower until I know where he stands on the great issues

that face this country, domestic and international. I want to know what his labor program is. I want to know where he stands on matters of social security. I want to know what his policy is in regard to inflation. What is his agricultural program? Where does he stand on reclamation, soil conservation, power development, and taxes? I want to know his position on the legion of vital questions which Members of the United States Senate are going to have to stand up and be counted on in the weeks immediately ahead. When those interested in his boom give me answers to those questions covering the fundamental question as to the general's position on the great legislative problems which face this country—or, in other words, as to what his platform is—then I shall answer the inquiries received today as to just where I stand on the Eisenhower boom.

I may say, as I said to the press the other day, that I think a great many progressives in America will show considerable interest in General Eisenhower if they can receive any assurance that he shares the views on social and economic questions held by my very good friend and a distinguished Member of this body, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is recognized as one of the official spokesmen of the Eisenhower boom.

Now, what about my position in the Kuter case? So that there may be no misunderstanding as to my position in regard to the transfer of military officers to civilian positions, and their being permitted to retain at the same time their active status in the Army and their salaries in the Army, which in the case of General Kuter would have been some \$5,000 more than the salary he would receive as a civilian, as chairman of a civilian commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, I want to read into the RECORD at this time a statement I have prepared on the issue. I hope this statement will be a complete answer to the inquiries I am receiving on the matter of why I opposed the Kuter appointment.

The statement is as follows:

I offered the motion in the Armed Services Committee meeting to reject the President's proposal that General Kuter be appointed Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board but be allowed to keep his active Army status and higher Army pay. I offered this motion because I think the basic principle of the President's proposal is unsound.

I raised objection to the proposal last week when it first reached the Armed Services Committee, and no new factors have been presented in the meantime which in my opinion justified a reversal of the position taken by the committee at that time.

My position on the matter is summed up by the following points:

1. One of the basic principles of representative government which our founding fathers safeguarded when they wrote the Constitution was to make certain that our form of government would be a civilian government free of military domination. It doesn't seem to me we can justify making exceptions to that principle simply because the President is finding it difficult—because of low salaries—to secure civilians to fill civilian posts.

If the salaries for our top administrative positions are too low, then the remedy is to increase the salaries; but not to transfer

to those civilian posts military personnel, unless and until those military men resign from the Army and return to full civilian status.

In other words, I have insisted in this controversy that the principle of filling civilian jobs with civilians stems from the constitutional origin of our Government.

2. The proposal to transfer General Kuter to the chairmanship of the CAB, and still permit him to retain his active Army status and his much higher Army pay, would result in an unfair discriminatory wage policy on the Civil Aviation Board.

It certainly is not fair to the other Commissioners on that Board to pay the Chairman of the Board better than \$5,000 more than they receive. Such a policy does not encourage either good feeling or the greatest of efficiency in Government service.

3. I opposed the transfer of General Kuter because I assume that when the Congress passed the appropriation budgets for the various branches of the military, those budgets were not watered with surplus personnel; but rather the services of all the officers are needed in connection with carrying out the work and duties of the Military Establishment.

However, the frequency with which it is suggested that civilian posts be filled with military personnel raises a question with me—and I know with a good many other Senators—as to whether we should not look into the question of decreasing the number of generals and admirals in the Army and the Navy if so many of them are so readily available for the filling of civilian posts. Perhaps the time has come to get a large number of them back to civilian status by legislation.

4. The committee was presented with a few precedents involving the transfer of military men to civilian posts and, as is usual under such circumstances, the argument was made that Kuter's appointment should be approved because of previous precedents.

My answer to that was and is that two wrongs never have made a right; and, further, I believe the time has come to put an end to such precedents.

I believe, if I hear the voice of the American people correctly—and as a Member of the Senate it is part of my job to keep my ear to the ground and listen to the will of the people—there is an overwhelming sentiment in support of putting an end to the practice of placing military personnel in civilian posts.

I am perfectly willing to vote to confirm any competent ex-military official to a civilian post, but I shall insist that he be in civilian status and not in active military status before I shall vote to confirm him.

5. It also is my position that it would have been no true service to the President if we had reversed ourselves on the Kuter case because, as I told the committee—and there was general agreement with me on the point—had we voted to approve of the transfer of General Kuter, it only would have resulted in a very controversial debate on the floor of the Senate; and, in my judgment, a majority of the Senate would have refused to sustain the committee.

I say that because a good many Members of the Senate not on the Armed Services Committee have informed me, personally, since the issue first arose that they would oppose this confirmation on the floor of the Senate. I think general opposition has developed in the Senate to the idea of appointing military men, still active in the Military Establishment, to civilian posts and permitting them to retain their active status in the Army or the Navy.

I wish to emphasize that the position I have taken in this case is completely nonpartisan. I am satisfied that the same attitude of nonpartisanship char-

acterized each and every member of the Armed Services Committee. I think my record shows that I never hesitate to support the President of the United States, irrespective of partisanship, when I think he is right on any issue—even subjecting myself to great criticism within my party for doing so at times. My record also shows that I never hesitate to vote against him when I think he is wrong. To my way of thinking, that is only carrying out the basic obligation which rests upon a Member of the Senate if he is to live up to the principles of representative government.

Because of the inquiries, communications, and protests which I have received since the action of the Armed Services Committee, I make this statement in order to make unequivocally clear the reasons for my action on the Kuter case, and the basis for my statement that not even by a stretch of the imagination can anyone justify inferring from my position that it means that I am for or against General Eisenhower as a possible nominee of the Republican Party for the Presidency.

#### REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to what I am about to say, if he is present. If not, he can read it in the RECORD.

In the New York Times of last Sunday, I read the following news items:

#### ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO DELAY ITS REPORT

WASHINGTON, January 17.—The Joint Economic Committee agreed today that it would not have time to make an adequate report on President Truman's economic message by February 1, as required by law. The group consequently authorized its chairman, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, to prepare a measure for congressional enactment postponing the dead line until March 1.

Senator TAFT indicated that similar steps might have to be taken with respect to the legislative budget. The joint Budget Committee is required to report to Congress February 15 its recommendation of a ceiling on Federal expenditures in the 1949 fiscal year beginning July 1.

Republicans were criticized in some quarters for the economic committee's failure to make a report last year and for the failure of the Senate and House to agree on terms of the legislative budget.

The Economic Committee's report is required by the Employment Act of 1946, under which it and the President's Council of Economic Advisers were established. The committee was not able to organize its staff in time to make a report last year.

The legislative budget procedure was set up under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Budget Committee, consisting of members of the Senate and House taxing and appropriating committees, met the February 15 dead line last year and recommended an expenditure ceiling representing a \$6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget. But while the House approved it, the Senate scaled down the cut to \$4,500,000,000, and the two Chambers never did agree on a compromise.

I think all of us can recall the interesting situation of last year, which developed over our failure to ever reach an agreement within the Republican majority as to what the budget cut should be in total amount. We ended up the session by failing to come forward with a

legislative budget, as required under the law. What I wish to address myself to for a moment is the newspaper report of the intention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to prepare some legislation extending the time both for the legislative budget and for the committee's economic report.

I suppose there is some truth in the old saying, "Better late than never." I think it is applicable to a great deal of the work of the Economic Report Committee to date. I say that most respectfully. I want the RECORD to show that on May 19, 1947, the junior Senator from Oregon commented on this very problem, and on the importance of our then and there taking action to postpone the date for filing the committee's economic report and for submitting a legislative budget. I introduced a joint resolution, which I judge it is quite proper for me to bring to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report at this time. I do so because apparently from the newspaper story I have read the committee is not aware that my May 19, 1947, joint resolution is a pending joint resolution, and was introduced in order to cover the very problem which the committee apparently discussed when it instructed my good friend from Ohio to prepare some legislation on this point. The joint resolution is brief. It reads as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That (a) the last sentence of section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 15" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15."*

*(b) Section 5 (b) (3) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."*

Although my resolution has been pending on the calendar for a great many months, I invite the attention of the committee to it now, and urge the committee to assist me in obtaining early action on the joint resolution. I judge from the New York Times story that the resolution would accomplish what the committee wishes to accomplish. I wish to add that I think the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has a great job to do. I think the country is watching it in connection with the whole question of inflation. We have a right to look to the committee to come forward with a constructive program which deals with inflation. The weeks which have passed since the special session of Congress have not resulted in any significant downward movement in prices. They have not resulted in any check on inflation. In many, many instances prices are climbing and climbing.

Although it is not very comfortable or personally pleasing for me to constantly be saying, "I told you so," nevertheless, attention must be called to what the RECORD shows as to the position which some of us took in the special session of Congress. Three of us on this side voted against the bill which was put through in the special session. As the RECORD shows, we stated in that debate that it would not accomplish any effective check on inflation; and it has not. I repeat: it never will. So, as I say, I am looking to the joint committee coming forward



with a program which has some really effective chance of doing something about inflation, which remains, as of this hour, the No. 1 domestic problem facing the country. It is the No. 1 political obligation of the Republican Party, which has a majority in the Congress in this session, to do something about checking inflation and the rising cost of living.

We must answer to those veterans, for example, who are writing to us a large number of letters containing such sentiments as are expressed in a paragraph from a letter which I received this morning from a veteran in college. He says:

I trust the Republican Party will do something effective about the spiraling cost of living. It is getting critical. We have hamburger once a week for our meat dish, and the prediction is higher prices yet. I got a job this week after living off savings all fall term.

He is a veteran in school. I digress a moment to say that our party has the responsibility on the House side of doing something about the veterans' legislation which remains bottled up in the House of Representatives. As the author of that legislation on this side, I say again what I have said before, that until my party does something about it in the House and gets that legislation on the way to the White House, it must assume responsibility for its nonpassage. I will take my chances on a Presidential veto once the bills are passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the President.

This veteran is one of the students who would benefit from that legislation. I think he should have had the benefits of it at the beginning of the fall term. I feel that we should have done something about the problem in the special session of Congress, so that he could have had the benefits of it at the beginning of the winter term. We certainly should do something now so that he may get the benefits of this legislation which has passed the Senate, in the spring term.

I read further from the veteran's letter:

We thought we might give school work full time for 9 months and then try to recoup our savings in the summer, but it became all too apparent that our savings were dwindling too fast.

Mr. President, I do not like a "hatchet" job any better than does anyone else, but so long as I feel that we Republicans have bogged down with regard to coming forward with a constructive program on the critical domestic issues facing the country, I shall continue to needle and needle, if that is what is necessary in order to get some action in support of a sound, constructive, progressive Republican program. The alternative is running the risk of another Democratic administration, which to date has certainly failed miserably in meeting the needs of our postwar economy insofar as effective stabilization is concerned. However, I think a majority of our people believe and I agree that at least the President is trying to secure the adoption by Congress of either his program or a better

one, if we on this side of the aisle will devise it.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director, Personnel and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director of Intelligence, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director of Army Education System and Commandant, Command and General Staff College, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Col. Wendell Westover, Army of the United States (colonel, Cavalry Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as executive for Reserve and ROTC affairs, Special Staff, United States Army;

Samuel T. Rhodes, Infantry, Andrew J. Roach, Quartermaster Corps, and Robert K. Weaver, Infantry, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

First Lt. Charles S. Gersoni, Medical Service Corps, for promotion in the Regular Army;

Maj. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Director, Service, Supply, and Procurement, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Gordon M. Johnson and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves, Army of the United States (brigadier general, assistant to the Chief of Engineers and lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project with the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Lauris Norstad (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, United States Air Force in Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and Administration, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Materiel, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Commander, Air Materiel Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Air Comptroller, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Brig. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Raymond Hartwell Fleming, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Draper, Jr., and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States;

Earl E. Stone, and sundry other officers, to be rear admirals in the Navy;

Vice Adm. John L. McCrea, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy commander in chief, Pacific Fleet;

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of the Material Division, Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy;

Maurice E. Curtis and Dixwell Ketcham, for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Capt. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet;

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces in the Mediterranean;

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air);

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet;

Capt. Howard M. Shaffer, and sundry other staff officers, for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the Navy; Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy;

Charles R. Mischke and Charles B. Teal (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps);

Jerry W. Bates to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed;

Edward F. Krueger to be an ensign in the Civil Engineers Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated;

Lowell K. Cunningham and several other civilian college graduates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy;

Marshall V. Perry (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

Thomas H. Boothman, and sundry other civilian college graduates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

Robert C. Doeringhaus and William E. Nims, civilian college graduates, to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

Patricia L. Ratcliffe to be ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, to correct spelling of name; and

William L. Eagleton and sundry other officers to be commander, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants in the Navy.

Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific;

Maj. Gen. Clifton B. Cates to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1948; and

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1948.

#### INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT— REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM PROTOCOL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, Eightieth Congress, second session, a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed in Washington on November 28, 1940.

The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Senate to the requirement that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty. Is it satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan that the injunction of secrecy on the treaty be removed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is entirely satisfactory.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD, together with accompanying papers.

The matters referred to are as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 11, until November 1, 1947. It was signed during that period for the United States of America, subject to ratification, and for the 14 other American Republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

Inasmuch as the previous extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement expired on October 1, 1947, and in view of the fact that the present protocol will extend the agreement for only 1 year from that date, I recommend that early consideration be given to the protocol by the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1948.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Protocol for the extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement—certified copies in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 20, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 thereof, was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 11, 1947, until November 1, 1947, and during that period was signed for the United States of America, subject to ratification, and for the 14 other American republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

The protocol retains the framework of the Inter-American Coffee agreement for a 1-year period, but suspends the provisions of articles I to VIII, inclusive, of that agreement, which relate to coffee quotas.

Article 3 of the protocol provides that the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by April 1, 1948, its recommendations regarding the type of cooperation which appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound and prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both consumers and producers. Article 3 of the protocol provides further that the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to make arrangements prior to October 1, 1948, for the transfer of its functions, assets, and records to an appropriate Inter-American or other international organization.

The 1-year extension provided for by the protocol has been recommended by an interdepartmental committee consisting of representatives of the interested agencies of the United States Government. The domestic coffee trade has indicated that it considers that the extension of the agreement for 1 year under the terms set forth in the protocol would be a desirable measure.

Information on the background and purposes of the coffee agreement is set forth in the report of January 8, 1941, by the Secretary of State to the President (Senate Executive A, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Advice and consent to ratification of the coffee agreement was given by the Senate on February 3, 1941. The agreement was ratified by the President on February 12, 1941, and the instrument of ratification by the United States deposited with the Pan American Union on April 14, 1941. On April 15, 1941, a protocol was signed at Washington, bringing the agreement into force on April 16, 1941, among the governments which had up to that time deposited ratifications or approvals of the agreement. The Congress of the United States, by joint resolution approved April 11, 1941, provided for the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the agreement on and after the entry into force of the agreement and during the continuation in force of the obligations of the United States thereunder (55 Stat. 133).

The agreement, which was to expire on October 1, 1943, was twice extended without modification for 1-year periods by unanimous approval of the signatory countries. That action was taken pursuant to the provisions of article XXIV of the agreement, which authorize the continuation of the agreement upon acceptance by all participating governments of a recommendation by the Inter-American Coffee Board that the duration of the agreement be extended. By a protocol open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 1, 1945, until November 1, 1945, the agreement was extended, with certain modifications, for an additional 1-year period from October 1, 1945. By a protocol open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, the agreement was extended, subject to certain conditions, for a further 1-year period from October 1, 1946. Those extensions also were approved by the domestic coffee trade.

Inasmuch as the previous extension of the agreement expired on October 1, 1947, and in view of the fact that the present protocol will extend the agreement for only 1 year from that date, the Department of State recommends its early approval on behalf of the Government of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

#### PROTOCOL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT FOR 1 YEAR FROM OCTOBER 1, 1947

Whereas an Inter-American Coffee Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in Washington on November 28, 1940; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed in Washington April 15, 1941, the Agreement was brought into force on April 16, 1941, in respect of the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol was signed on April 15, 1941; and

Whereas article XXIV of the said Agreement provides that it should continue in force until October 1, 1943; and

Whereas by unanimous consent the Governments signatory to the Agreement twice extended the said Agreement unchanged for 1-year periods, these extensions being duly attested by two certified and signed Declarations passed by the Inter-American Coffee Board on May 12, 1943 and July 25, 1944, respectively, which were duly deposited in the Pan American Union on June 11, 1943, and September 11, 1944, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of article XXIV of the Agreement; and



Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1945, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1945, with certain changes recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1946, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

Now, therefore, in support of a recommendation made by the Inter-American Coffee Board on September 11, 1947, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol, considering that it is feasible, pending further efforts toward completion of international and inter-American arrangements for dealing with commodity problems, that the Agreement should be prolonged for one additional year, subject to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory to the present Protocol for a period of one year from October 1, 1947.

#### ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol agree that the provisions of Article I through and including VIII of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

#### ARTICLE 3

(a) During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by April 1, 1948, its recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the Agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in an understanding regarding the type of cooperation, whether inter-American or other international, that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound and prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both consumers and producers.

(b) Such recommendations shall be in accordance with general principles of commodity policy which are embodied in the Chapter on Inter-governmental Commodity Arrangements drafted in the First Session of the Preparatory Committee on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment or which may be embodied in the Charter for an International Trade Organization if such Charter is concluded prior to the submission of such recommendations by the Board.

(c) The Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to make arrangements prior to October 1, 1948, for the transfer of its functions, assets and records to an appropriate inter-American or other international organization.

#### ARTICLE 4

The present Protocol shall be open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 11, 1947, until November 1, 1947, provided, however, that all signatures shall be deemed to have been affixed under date of October 1, 1947, and the Protocol shall be considered as having entered into force on that date with respect to the governments on behalf of which it is signed.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at the City of Washington in the English, Spanish, Portuguese and French languages. The original instrument in each language shall be deposited in the Pan Amer-

ican Union which shall furnish certified copies to the Governments signatory to this Protocol.

CARLOS MARTINS PEREIRA E SOUZA	Brazil
ANDRÉS URIBE C.	Colombia
J. RAFAEL OREAMUNO	Costa Rica
GMO. BELT	Cuba
JULIO ORTEGA	Dominican Republic
C. J. AROSEMENA	Ecuador
CARLOS A. SIRI	El Salvador
ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE	Guatemala
JOSEPH D. CHARLES	Haiti
JULIÁN R. CÁCERES	Honduras
V. SÁNCHEZ GAVITO JR.	Mexico
GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA	Nicaragua
C. ALZAMORA	Peru
WILLARD L. THORP,	
(Subject to Ratification)	
United States of America	
M. A. FALCÓN-BRICEÑO	Venezuela

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original, in English, of the Protocol for the Extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement for one year from October 1, 1947, deposited in the Pan American Union.

Washington, D. C., December 4, 1947  
[SEAL] WILLIAM MANGER,  
Secretary of the Governing Board of  
the Pan American Union.

#### RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday, January 23, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 23, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1948:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

A. Ogden Pierrot, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis A. Flood, of Oklahoma.  
Owen T. Jones, of Ohio.  
John W. Henderson, of Iowa, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Elleard B. Heffern, of Missouri.  
Charles E. Higdon, of Tennessee.  
Samuel Owen Lane, of California.  
Richard F. Lankenau, of Indiana.  
William L. Magistretti, of California.  
Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois.  
Clinton L. Olson, of California.  
David Post, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.  
William D. Craig, of California.  
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.  
Francis C. Grant, Jr., of Pennsylvania.  
Matthew J. Looman, Jr., of New York.  
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.  
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.  
John F. O'Donnell, Jr., of Massachusetts.  
Howard W. Potter, Jr., of New York.

##### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for terms of 2 years from January 22, 1948:

Harvey Jones Gunderson, of South Dakota.  
Henry T. Bodman, of Michigan.  
Henry A. Mulligan, of New York.  
John D. Goodloe, of Kentucky.  
Harley Hise, of California.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi, vice Wyatt T. Reese, term expired.

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:  
Frank S. French  
Emanuel E. Mandel  
To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:  
George B. Hutchison

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:  
Ward A. Kemp, October 10, 1947.

To the rank of captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:  
Jack Senior, January 1, 1948.

Ronald D. Horne, March 1, 1948.

Charles K. Green, March 1, 1948.

To the rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Henry C. Warwick, January 1, 1948.

Benjamin H. Rigg, March 1, 1948.

Albert J. Hoskinson, March 1, 1948.

To the rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Ernest B. Lewey, January 1, 1948.

John C. Mathisson, March 1, 1948.

George E. Morris, March 1, 1948.

##### IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

Rear Adm. Henry R. Oster, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

##### LIEUTENANT

James A. Warren

##### LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles F. Grad Leon J. Dura  
Harvey E. Lewis Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.  
John E. Aicken

##### ENSIGNS

Stewart W. Damon Robert S. Haley  
Robert A. Evans, Jr. Richard J. O'Brien  
Fritz H. Hediger

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Alfred H. Noble  
Graves B. Erskine

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Edward A. Craig  
Thomas J. Cushman

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, in meditation and prayer we would ponder these great injunctions: Know thyself, control thyself, give thyself. Through the dawning of each day may their growth be determined in our lives, thus fulfilling our God-given best.

O Lord, the greatness of a nation depends not upon its resources but how it uses them; forbid that we should waste or foolishly dissipate them. Let our thoughts be centered in a passion for higher things; make us strong in Thy strength, wise in Thy wisdom, and loving in Thy love. Give us the spirit of courage to overcome our faults, casting out the beam from our own eye, and extending our horizons of brotherhood and understanding. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech made to the people of his district.

Mr. CROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by James F. O'Neal, national commander of the American Legion, made before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Martinsburg Journal on the subject They Are Not Broke.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article. I am advised by the Public Printer that the length of the article is in excess of the amount allowed under the rules to the extent of \$177. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I received permission to extend

my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the remarks exceed the usual amount allowed to the extent of \$230.75. Notwithstanding the excess amount, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of grain allocation for the beverage distilling industry.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Mr. Straus, of the Reclamation Bureau, and in the other to include resolutions passed by the Nebraska Reclamation Association.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Peoria Journal of January 4.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Naval Air Service Has Record of No Passenger Fatalities During 1947."

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled "The Tariff Issue."

## THE CRIPPLED CAB AND CAA

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the morning paper that there has been another air accident near Boston. Fortunately, no lives were lost, but this seems to be due to the courage and the pluck of the passengers and crew. While we have continuous air crashes in the United States of America, the Civil Aeronautics Board is without a chairman. The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority has offered his resignation.

At a press conference within the last 2 weeks, it was indicated that the appointing authority did not even realize that another vacancy existed on the CAB. And this morning's papers announce the resignation of still another member. Another member of the CAA has asked for a 4-year leave of absence.

The CAB is 2 years behind in its docket. Employee morale is at a very low ebb. Here we have two of the most responsible boards that are subject to the appointing power of the President in a state of inefficiency and disintegration. The President recently suggested the name of an Air Forces man to be head of the CAB, but that was not satisfactory because it was proposed that he be chairman of a civilian board but at the same time draw his Air Force pay as a general of the Air Forces. The CAB could have come under the control of the Army Air Force. How can one man serve two masters?

The situation is one which should receive prompt attention by the Congress, for the appointing authority is either unable or unwilling to designate competent personnel to insure the carrying out of the air safety program. The lives and safety of the air-traveling public should no longer be endangered by politics, indecision, or callous indifference.

## RETIRED RAILROAD EMPLOYEES AND THEIR SURVIVORS ARE IN THE FORGOTTEN CLASS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947, hours have been consumed with oratory designed to indoctrinate the American people with the plight of those in various parts of the world who have been victims of the war and, as a result, deprived of the necessities of life. In response, this Congress has already appropriated millions of dollars to aid unfortunate people in various countries, to say nothing of billions of dollars appropriated by previous Congresses.

While these acts of world-wide charity were being practiced at the direct expense of the American taxpayers, millions of our own citizens are in dire and desperate straits because of their inability to purchase the bare necessities of life on account of the present high cost of living. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the increase in the cost of living reached an all-time high of 67.2 percent above the August 1939 level.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are thousands of retired employees under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. These groups are suffering greatly because of the meager benefits they are receiving. It should be remembered that these groups represent the stalwart citizens of yesterday, who, by their labor and the payment of taxes, played such an important role in building this great Nation.

In the President's recent message on the state of the Union, he endorsed the sentiment of many of us in Congress that the provisions of the Social Security Act should be liberalized.

It is common knowledge that veterans' benefits have been increased at two different intervals the past several years.